NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

NO. DCLXXXVII

FEBRUARY, 1913

RATIONAL TARIFF REVISION

BY AMOS K. FISKE

In treating the tariff question the common tendency is to work upon the lines of a theory and give too little attention to practical considerations in its application. It is apt to be treated, on the one hand, as if all nations were at the same stage of industrial development, about equal in productive capacity, at peace with one another and likely to remain so, interdependent and devoted to common interests in the world's advancement. On the other hand, it is treated as if each nation was to pursue a destiny of its own, with interests diverse from and independent of those of other nations, with nothing mutual in their relations. Too little consideration is given to differences of circumstances and conditions and what may be regarded as the opportunism of nations at an imperfect stage of the world's progress.

If we could imagine an ideal state of the nations, each fairly developed in its capacity for production from the resources with which it is endowed by nature, with substantially equal facilities established for their industry and trade, and with no reason on the part of any to fear anything from dependence upon others for the supply of their wants—in such case absolute freedom of trade, with the least possible obstruction or restriction, would be the best policy for all. Then each could be devoted to the production

Copyright, 1913, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for which its natural resources, its climate, and the character and circumstances of its people were best adapted. It could thereby produce the highest value of which it was capable, of those things that were in demand in the world's markets, and by exchanging the surplus above its own needs for the products which other lands could produce to better advantage and which would minister to those needs at the least cost, it would reach the greatest prosperity attainable for itself. But the nations are not so situated.

When the thirteen American colonies of Great Britain formed their union of States and established an independent nation, what is called free trade was practically unknown and tariff systems, as a means of regulating the development of trade, were equally unknown. International trade was a haphazard affair, conducted according to no theory and upon no recognized system, and the relation of nations was generally that of hostility rather than amity. When Alexander Hamilton proposed the adoption of a tariff of duties upon such foreign goods as the people of this country had to import or go without, his dominant idea was to stimulate and hasten the establishment of industries for the home production of such goods, so far as practicable, with a view to supporting the nation's independence and making it self-sufficing, or as little as possible dependent upon the good will of others or the maintenance of peace between them. This was an intelligible policy.

The States were formed out of a fragment of the continent along the Atlantic coast, with indefinite and unknown possibilities of expansion in national area, with inexhaustible resources and opportunities, but a feeble population of hardly more than half that of the present State of New York. There was little development of industries outside of the household, beyond those of the farm, the forest, and the streams and seacoast. The situation of the young nation was one of relative weakness and dependence upon others, which might at any time become unfriendly or be engaged in warfare with one another to the interruption of commerce on the seas. A policy of protection was regarded as a policy of defense as well as of material development and progress. In either aspect it could be justified.

There is no doubt that the policy early adopted and long continued in a rather spasmodic fashion served its intended purpose in a large measure. It was costly and had to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paid for out of the resources and the industries natural to the country in the nation's infancy; but the result was doubtless worth more than the cost. Beyond question it contributed powerfully to the planting and diversification of industries, the increase of population, and the growth of the nation's power. The crude industries of the country in the early part of the last century created surplus capital slowly and there was no chance of speedy accumulation. There was scant experience or training, as well as lack of means, for establishing manufacturing industries and practically no skilled labor of the right kind. The policy of closing or restricting the market for foreign goods had of itself no power to create capital or industrial enterprise or skill in the use of machinery. It could only stimulate their application by the pressure of need and the incentive of gain. By giving a high price to imported goods it would attract capital and divert labor to making similar goods at home, so far as the means were at hand; but by far the most important effect was to induce the transfer of capital and of skilled labor from other lands to our own. We imported capital and labor instead of their products, and thereby built up industries, increased population, and strengthened the nation.

This may be called an artificial process instead of a natural growth, but in the same sense all human institutions are artificial. It produced results in half a century which would probably not have been attained in twice the time without the artificial stimulus, though they might have been sounder when attained. Abuses have attended the stimulated development, but no human progress requiring emulation and striving has been free from abuses. The protective policy had about served its purpose before the middle of the last century. The "infant industries" had been fostered and nourished into vigorous growth and had become well diversified—as industries then were, for some of those of to-day had hardly been born. They had been fed with the substance of the land and in return for their nourishing had stimulated the production of that substance by making a larger "home market" for it. The benefit to natural and acquired industries was mutual.

When the tariff received its "downward revision" in 1846, the work of the protective policy was supposed to have been substantially completed. The tariff based upon the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Walker report is usually called a "revenue tariff." The Government had become dependent mainly upon duties on imports for its financial support and this simplified tariff was devised primarily to raise the needed revenue, but it left much "incidental protection" to American industries, whether it was still needed or not. Under that tariff manufacturing industries advanced as never before, partly as the result of increased immigration. It produced more than the needed revenue, and there was a further reduction in 1857 with hardly a protest. The infant industries were grown up. There was capital and skilled labor in the country which had no occasion to fear foreign competition, with the advantage of still unlimited resources on their side.

Then came the culmination of the long conflict against slavery on the soil dedicated to freedom, the attack upon the union of States, and the long and costly struggle for its preservation. This started a new era for the nation's tariff policy and set in action the forces which created the later abuses of the protective system. A number of States were withdrawn from the support of the Government and a large number of men in the others were taken from productive industries and the conduct of the business of distributing and exchanging products. The cost of government was enormously increased and much of the expenditure was not only destructive of values but exceedingly wasteful. The nation was rapidly taking upon itself the burden of debt, and the financial devices resorted to were far from economical. There had to be national taxation such as had never been dreamed of before. It took every available form. Industry and trade had to bear their share by contributing to internal revenue, and duties on imports were largely increased to balance these exactions upon domestic operations, as well as to swell the public income necessary to meet the exigencies of war.

Incidentally the measure of protection from the tariff was increased to stimulate the industries which were hampered by the withdrawal of labor to recruit the army and by rising prices. The opportunity was seized by those interested in manufactures to increase the rate of their profits, while the needs of the Government for the support of military operations enlarged the market for many products. The tendency to draw labor and capital from abroad was intensified, and the work of destruction, together with a depreciating cur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rency and rising prices, caused a semblance of unwonted prosperity very uneven in distribution in the northern part of the Union. At the same time the expansion of population over unoccupied land of rich possibilities did not cease and the need of larger facilities for transportation was keenly felt. The exigencies of the time called for an easier and quicker means of communication between the East and the States of the Pacific coast across the mountain barrier. In this the Government had a large interest, on account of the struggle then going on, and extended its credit and granted property in land to aid private capital in railroad enterprise upon which no adequate return could be expected for many years, thus adding to the burden of debt.

It was during this period of stress and struggle that the foundation was laid for a new era of "protection for American industries" and the development of the "home market" by the imposition of duties upon imported goods, which should be a more effective bar against foreign competition. Protected interests had grown powerful with the Government and influential in politics. The dominant party of the time had its birth in the contest against the extension and the growing power of slavery and gained its strength in the struggle for the preservation of the Union. It was not primarily a party of tariff protection, though it had been made up largely from the disintegrated elements of the old Whig party and was the natural heir to its sentiment and its policy when the question of reforming the war tariff came up, as it inevitably did when the expenses induced by the conflict were cut down and the need of revenue was diminished, notwithstanding the heavy debt charges and the expenditure for pensions.

The protected interests had grown rich and powerful, and were ready to support the party which would take care of them, fearing to lose the advantages they had gained and the profits they were enjoying at the expense of the people. The manufacturers were banded together to prevent any reduction of duties which would be damaging to them, and there were distinct organizations for resistance to anything which would impair protection to American industry or open loopholes in the tariff barrier for foreign competition to enter the home market. While internal revenue taxes were reduced or removed, customs duties were maintained, resulting in increased protection. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentiment engendered by the struggle for the defense of the Union and kept up during the process of reconstructing and strengthening it by new constitutional guarantees was slow to subside, and the party attachments of the period were difficult to relax. But the question of revising the tariff gradually asserted itself and became an issue between parties again about ten years after the close of the war.

The Democratic party declared its old position in favor of a revenue tariff and against the policy of protection in 1876, and it is needless to recall the electoral contest which debarred it by so narrow a margin from the opportunity of making a practical test of the sentiment of the country on the question of revision. But the Republican party was spurred up to making serious inquiry into the subject by a mixed commission, created by Congress but not composed of members of the Senate and House of Representatives. After a fairly thorough investigation, it rendered a report subsequent to the national elections of 1880, adhering to the principle and policy of protection, but recommending substantial reductions in duties. The Republican party was then in control of Congress and the Executive Administration, and the measures proposed were defeated. It is hardly necessary to recall in any detail the course of events since that time as they are related to tariff revision.

How far it has been the determining factor in national elections it is hard to calculate, as it has been invariably mingled with other issues. The election of a Democratic President in 1884 was largely due to a demand for administrative reforms and to dissatisfaction with the Republican party for other reasons than its position on the tariff. The unequivocal manner in which President Cleveland came out for tariff revision in accordance with the declared policy of his party near the end of his term is generally regarded as having contributed to his defeat for a re-election. There is less doubt about the Republican revision, with increased protection, under the administration which followed having contributed to his return four years later. The issue was, however, confused with that of the currency, the public mind was distracted by a financial panic and its consequences, and the revision of the tariff by the Wilson-Gorman bill of 1894, which the President denounced but allowed to become law without his approval, was little short of a fiasco.

The reaction which brought the Republicans back into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

control in 1897 was not due to the tariff, but to the currency issue. Nevertheless, the party was prompt in taking advantage of the situation, and President McKinley, author of the revision of 1890, called the extraordinary session of Congress at which the Dingley tariff was enacted with its high protective features. Then came the Spanish War and the distractions of a "colonial policy," and the tariff hardly figured in the election in 1900 or even in 1904. The formation of large combinations of capital known as "trusts," and alleged abuses of corporate power in maintaining excessive prices and excessive or discriminating charges for transportation, superseded it in the public interest. Strengthening the law for the regulation of interstate commerce and that against restraint of trade, known as the "Anti-Trust Act," and the prosecution of offenses under these statutes absorbed attention and relegated tariff revision to a secondary place. It nevertheless had sufficient prominence in the public mind to induce the party of protection to promise a revision of the Dingley tariff in its platform of 1908. How much that contributed to its success at the election of that year no one can tell, but there is little doubt that disappointment with what had to pass as a fulfilment of the promise had much to do with a decided reaction against the party responsible for it.

Notwithstanding all the confusion wrought by agitation over other "progressive" issues, ranging from moderate to extreme radical proposals, and the unwonted and undemocratic devotion to the personal claims of candidates, the question of tariff revision became an influential factor in the last election. The question was more nearly ripe for a rational decision than at any time in fifty years. All parties were ready to acknowledge the abuses that have grown up under the tariff during that period and the need of a remedy. With nearly the same unanimity they were agreed that the methods by which rates of duty had been adjusted at the suggestion or the dictation of interests which derive benefit from them must be abandoned. The main difference related to the theory that was to prevail in the process of revision and the ultimate purpose to be attained. Few are now in favor of a sudden and radical overhauling, the quick destruction of one system to build another upon its ruins, for all recognize the fact that the industries and the business of the country have become so interlaced with the structure

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that it cannot be shattered without disastrous results, however much better that might be which would replace it. Industries and business must go on without serious disturbance if the people are to prosper or even live in comfort, and such a disturbance would produce a profound reaction and force a movement backward. The system cannot be wrecked like an old building that a better may be erected in its place.

The problem is one of to-day and not of a generation ago or a generation to come, and its solution must have due regard to existing conditions. The contest is along the line of the old division between a fundamental policy of a tariff for revenue only and a tariff with protection of American industries against foreign competition as a primary object. One would aim at making trade with other nations free from restriction by taxation levied upon it for the very purpose of restriction. The other would deliberately restrict it by taxation for the purpose of stimulating and building up domestic trade. The ultimate object of one is the production of an increasing surplus of such commodities as can be produced in this country to the best advantage to be exchanged for those which can be produced and purchased to better advantage in other countries, cost of transportation duly considered in each case. The other maintains that it will be of permanent benefit to the nation and its people to produce and distribute at home as large a variety of products for meeting their own wants as the resources and conditions of the country will permit. This is no longer advocated as a means of making the nation self-sufficing and independent of others, but it is claimed for it that it makes the profit of capital and the wages of labor higher and so contributes to the general prosperity.

Therein lies the chief fallacy of the protective theory, and this assumption abandons the ground upon which it was originally founded. The country is no longer in its infancy. Its vast area of land is fairly taken up and the natural sources of its wealth have been opened and their development is well under way. Its population is approximating a hundred million. It has accumulated capital to a vast amount, though it continues to attract it, as it attracts labor, from other countries by its natural advantages. Its industries have been established and diversified at great cost and have in them the forces of growth. The growth of some is now visibly hampered by lack of freedom in trade.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What, then, is the real source of the higher profit for capital and the higher wages for labor, or the "higher standard of living," so far as these exist, in this country compared with other countries which are its rivals in the world of trade? Here we must make a distinction which is too often lost sight of. We must remember that what we are working for in this life is not money, but what money will buy. Money is only a means of reckoning and of effecting the exchange of other things. The profit from the use of capital is to be measured to the owner, not by the number of dollars it will bring him per year, but by the amount of the substance of wealth which it will put at his command, whether of houses and lands or of articles of necessity or comfort and convenience or of luxury. The compensation for labor is measured to the workman not by the number of dollars per week, per month, or per year that come to him, but by the share in the fruits of his labor and of other men's capital that his wages enable him to get. Where the price, or the cost to the buyer, of those things whereby men live is as high in proportion as the profit or the wages which furnish the means of obtaining them, there is no advantage in the "high standard." It is abundance and a fair distribution that tell for comfort and prosperity.

Why should wages and profits, measured not strictly in dollars, but in the substance of material wealth, be higher in this country than in Europe, Asia, and Africa or the islands of the sea? It is determined by two factors in the production of wealth, taking wealth in its broad sense of those things which contribute to the weal of the people and of the nation. The first factor is the natural resources, advantages, and opportunities of the country, the extent of its land, the fertility of its soil, the riches of its forests, its mineral deposits and its waters, the quality and variety of its climate, and the means and facilities provided by nature for transportation by lake and stream or through valleys and over plains. Has the United States no natural advantage in these respects for producing wealth and distributing it with a liberal hand?

The other great factor in the production of wealth is men. Given the resources and materials, the advantages and opportunities, and what will be made of them depends upon the character of the population, the intelligence, the enterprise, the energy, the industry—in short, the efficiency for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

production and saving of the people of the country. Are those of the United States inferior in these respects to those of other nations? If so, much of the advantage it may have in natural resources and opportunities will be sacrificed by lack of qualities in the people to benefit by them. In the rivalry of nations for the creation of wealth that which has the advantage of natural resources and opportunities will prosper most, the human factors being equal. That which excels in the human factor will be most prosperous if there is equality in the other factor. One that has the advantage in both will forge ahead, and one that is lacking in both will lag behind. Where does the United States stand in this rivalry? So far as a nation, with the working together of the two prime factors of production, produces more wealth per head in a given time than another nation, wages and profits will be higher, measured in what they will bring to the worker and the employer, regardless of the counters by means of which they are reckoned and recorded. If either worker or employer is getting less than his share, or is not better off than those of other countries, there is something wrong in the distribution. The "standard of living" should be higher, whatever the rate of wages or of profits in figures.

What is the significance of all this in relation to our tariff? It means that while industries were being built up and diversified by planting and fostering new ones, while capital was accumulating and labor was being trained to new occupations, and while both capital and labor were attracted from other countries by obstructing the ingress of their products, wages and profits derived from the application of native labor and capital to abundant natural resources and opportunities paid in part the wages and profits that made the new industries to thrive. They were not paid by the foreigner whose products got into the country in spite of the tariff barrier. The consumers paid the duties in the added price for the imported products, and they paid the extra price for the products of the domestic industries which the manufacturers were able to charge. The people of the country paid for all the benefit that may have resulted in the development of the industries. They were able to do it and perhaps it was worth the cost.

Assuming that the result originally aimed at by the policy of protection for American industries has been attained,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the stimulus and extra incentive are no longer needed, what then? What will be the result of discarding it? If it is to be discarded, what shall the process be? It is hardly worth while here to recount the excesses and abuses which have grown up under the protective system. They have been made sufficiently familiar, though some may have been exaggerated. The barrier has guarded capital against foreign competition and enabled it to make combinations for the control of the home market in various lines, to advance prices and increase profits, to exercise power in politics and legislation. It has not guarded labor against competition, for that has come in free. Labor has attempted by organization to effect combinations for increasing or maintaining wages, but it cannot maintain them long above the competitive standard of the country because the protected industries not only attract foreign labor when wages are high, but they attract labor from unprotected occupations whenever the compensation offered is above that of those occupations, or even equal to it, if the employment offered is in other respects more attractive.

Protection has not made the standard of wages in this country, but it has made it possible to pay "American wages" in a variety of industries which could not have obtained the needed labor without it, at least not until after there had been a much slower development. Thereby it has stimulated and hastened development and attracted both foreign capital and foreign labor by keeping out their products or greatly restricting their admission. Now that the results have been substantially attained, capital and labor share in the employment, but capital alone gets the benefit of any excess of protection above what is necessary to maintain the industries.

Capitalists have the financing and management in their hands. They do the buying and selling and the directing. They pay for labor and they pay what they have to pay in order to obtain it under the prevailing standard of wages, and no more. The workmen cannot raise that standard by any organization of their forces without inviting more competition in their employment from abroad and from other occupations at home to bring it down again to its normal level. There is an easy way of directing an extra profit from unnecessary protection into the coffers of corporations and the dividends of shareholders. There is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no way of getting any part of it into the " pay envelope of the wage-earner."

Taking conditions as they are to-day, as the result of the protective policy as it has prevailed for more than half a century, what do we mean by " necessary protection " and " excessive protection "? There are some highly developed protected industries which have every advantage over those of other countries and need no protection. All their advantages for years have gone to capital in dividends upon stock largely " watered " and to enriching with value in new property the diluted capitalization, drawing that value from consumers in higher prices. The iron and steel industry is a conspicuous example. The benefit goes to labor only so far as it may be voluntarily accorded by " welfare " devices as a means of keeping labor contented with what it gets. Other industries would need no protection if the system did not have the effect of making their cost of production abnormally high. These industries have to buy materials and supplies from one another, and they must charge high prices because they must pay high prices. There is no advantage in trading on such an artificial level any more than in doing work on a high scaffolding which may as well or better be done on the level of the ground.

If the system could be adjusted on a basis to afford only the protection that is needed now to maintain industries that have been built up by protection, there are few that would suffer and there are many that would benefit. Their workmen would lose nothing, their proprietors would receive the legitimate return upon capital, and users and consumers of their products would benefit greatly. The production and trade of the country would expand much more steadily and safely, and the fruits of the general activity would be far more equitably distributed. There are few manufacturing industries which, freed from the hampering effects of duties which are supposed to protect others and the uncertainties of high and fluctuating prices, would not grow in a more healthy, vigorous, and flourishing manner. That is almost certainly the case with most textile industries which are well established. The United States produces more than two-thirds of the world's supply of raw cotton, and without protection it would be at no disadvantage in providing itself with buildings and machinery. The " home market " is always protected by the cost of transportation of material

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to and of products from other countries. Under normal conditions, there is no reason why this country should need protection against the competition of foreign cotton goods in its own markets or why it should not compete successfully in supplying such goods to other countries.

With untaxed raw materials and machinery it could surely hold its own in manufactures from wool, wood, metals, and probably in those from hemp, flax, and similar fibers. It would probably have taken long for such industries as those of linen and lace-making and of silk manufacturing to develop in this country without the stimulus of protection, because labor and capital would have been busily employed in others that were easier to build up. Perhaps these and some others could not be maintained now without protection. Where such is the case and capital is invested in any considerable measure and labor is employed on a considerable scale in the industries, it would not be fair to take away the support upon which they had been induced to rely. There are many industries that have been built up much more rapidly than they otherwise would have been by tariff protection, and some of them cannot yet be sustained without it. Some may need it for a long time to come. There may be things the domestic production of which is so important to the country, while the advantage in their production is so much greater elsewhere, that permanent protection for them would be justified. If so it can be granted, but it will necessarily be at the expense of other industries and the benefit will be special.

Let us come now to what should and can be done in a sensible and practical way in the revision of the tariff. There will be a wide difference of opinion between those who still cherish the belief that there is advantage to the people of the country in maintaining industries on a basis of artificial cost and high prices, by shielding their products from competition with foreign products of the same kind in the home market, and those who believe this policy to be a disadvantage. With the former, so far as they have no personal interest to serve, it will be difficult to undo the teaching of two or three generations. So far as they have such interest and are honestly convinced that what benefits them is a general benefit, they cannot be persuaded. For the people as a whole it would be a substantial advantage to adjust the tariff upon a basis which would yield the needed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revenue at the least cost for collection, with the least interference with the natural course of industry and trade in the country, and with the smallest restriction upon commerce with other nations.

With the artificial and complex system that we have on our hands this cannot be done suddenly, hastily, or carelessly without disastrous results to many. It must be done with due regard for some principle accepted as sound in theory, but it must be done with intelligent and studious care and by a gradual process, or there will be disturbance and trouble which will cause confusion and set back the cause of revision instead of advancing it. There must be a disregard of old party divisions so far as honest convictions on the subject do not conform to them. It is difficult to obtain a non-partisan treatment of so vital a question of public policy, but if this task is to be achieved safely, successfully, and within a reasonable period, either those who favor a well-defined policy must align themselves with a party pledged to carry it out and must adhere to it until the work is accomplished, or those in favor of such a policy must unite regardless of party lines which may divide them with reference to other issues. That either course will be consistently and continuously pursued by a sufficient number to get the work done speedily, effectively, and harmoniously is too much to expect. But the effort should be made in that direction, that by more or less of compromise and with more or less halting steps progress may be made which will grow easier as one difficulty after another is overcome and the beneficial results of the steps taken are demonstrated. The problem is a living one and must be solved. The issue confronts the nation and is vital to its prosperity and progress in a long future. It cannot be suppressed or evaded long at a time. It will not be settled and stay settled until it is settled in accordance with principles which experience proves to be sound.

AMOS K. FISKE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE NAVY

BY HUGO MÜNSTERBERG

THE world is full of the glory of the development of modern battle-ships, full of admiration for the tremendous material values which they represent and for the technical triumphs which are achieved by the perfection of their guns and machinery. The world of newspaper readers is hypnotized by the stupendous possibilities which the Dreadnoughts of our day have created, and its imagination is excited by the improvements and inventions, by the torpedoes and submarines, and the turrets which make the naval battle of the future the most gigantic technical problem of the age. But in the midst of this unquestioning enthusiasm for the material development and the physical progress of the battle-ship we ought not to forget that it is, after all, the man, man's thought and man's emotion and man's will which is of decisive importance. It is a popular prejudice to expect success only from the marvels of steel and powder and electricity. The great lesson of history demonstrates that throughout four thousand years the victory has been with the ships of those who were fit to win. It is not true that fate has been with the heavy guns; it has always been with the great minds. The knowledge of the ships and armament becomes a living power only if it is embedded in the understanding of strategics and grand tactics, and they would be empty if the psyche of man were not acknowledged as their center. With this background of feelings the men of the navy have turned to psychology to inquire whether the study of the mind may be made serviceable to the navy in peace or in war.

The psychologist of a few years ago would have felt embarrassed if men of that great world in which guns are pointed and battles fought had come as intruders into his quiet laboratory-rooms, where he was carrying on his patient

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

researches into the traits and the mechanism of the human mind. His science had grown up far from the turmoil of the world of clashing interests in the repose and quietude of pure academic life. Psychologists studied consciousness, its laws, and its surprising developments with all the means of exact modern methods, but never with a thought of dragging the results into the market-places and of making practical use of that which was sought for knowledge's sake only. But the last few years have brought a radical change. The treasures of knowledge which were heaped up in the store-houses of the modern psychologist have at last been coined and made serviceable to the demands of the day. The psychologists began to aid the efforts of the school-teachers who had too long forgotten that the human mind of the pupil is the only important element in the school; they began to help the physicians who had too long neglected the fundamental rôle which the mind plays in the health and disease of the patient; they began to aid the lawyer and the judge who had too long dealt with crime without analyzing the criminal's mind; they even began to aid the merchant and the captain of industry whose customers and whose laborers are minds which may be studied with profit from the point of view of psychological science. They have served the social reformer and the vocational counselor, even the artist and the minister; in short, they have in recent years developed an applied psychology which stands to the theoretical work of our laboratories as the science of the engineer stands to physics or chemistry. It is a psychotechnical science which cannot acknowledge barriers where the human mind is working in the interplay of social energies. Commanding a ship or fulfilling the orders of the commander, shaping the plans of a battle or pointing the gun, directing a submarine or aiming a torpedo, sending the wireless message or even feeding the engines in the hold of the ship while the cannons are thundering, is an activity of the mind, and it is not only the right, but the duty, of the psychologist to consider conscientiously whether his science may not be applied in this realm of human efficiency too.

The problems which might most naturally suggest themselves at the very threshold are those which are common to the seafaring world independent of whether the ship is to fight or peacefully to carry passengers and freight from shore to shore, the problems of navigation. We ought not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to overlook the fact that certain elements of exact psychology indeed entered the naval service quite a number of years ago. I refer to the study of color-blindness. No one has a right to become a seaman who is unable to discriminate the color signals of the passing ships, but these facts of color-blindness which are to-day such a matter of course in the naval world had to be slowly examined by psychological studies, and the tests by which these abnormities of the human eye are traced are still being steadily elaborated in the workshops of the psychologists. Even in this apparently well-known little field the psychologist goes on discovering new phenomena. Many types of color-weakness and color-deficiency can be traced to-day which a few years ago would still have escaped the notice of the experimenter; and the more intimately the naval service remains in contact with the progress of these sense studies, by introducing the newest subtle methods of testing, the greater the chance of eliminating mistakes which might spell disaster.

I am inclined to believe that variations and deficiencies of hearing, well known to the psychologist, may be of a certain significance too in the problems of navigation. Only in recent years has a careful psychological study been devoted to the mental conditions of the localization of sound. The experiments which aimed at determining the directions of sound which can be discriminated were carried on in the hope of clearing up the theory of space perception. The psychologist, studying space perception, asks how far the cooperation of the two ears is necessary in order to determine exactly the direction and what angles of deviation can be discerned and what directions of sound may be confused with one another. No one of these laboratory studies was undertaken with practical purposes in view, and yet it seems probable that the officer who is to determine the direction of the fog-horn's sound would profit from an acquaintance with such psychological investigations, and that psychological tests might eliminate many a man from the list of those who are considered competent to judge the sounds in a fog. The new duty of listening to the submarine bells involves other acoustical functions which may also make psychological inquiries advisable. But the mental analysis would trace strong individual differences with regard to many other features which might mean good or evil for the profession of the navigator.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The officer on the bridge is in a very different position, according to whether his mental imagery is of the visual or of the motor-acoustical type. The one may carry in consciousness a vivid picture of the map of the shore, with its lighthouses and signals, while the other may possess his knowledge in the form of words and figures. Both may know the same data, and each kind of knowledge has its particular advantages for certain purposes, but the two men take an entirely different attitude toward the channel through which they have to pass, and the difference may be momentous. Still more important are the psychological differences in the ability of men to observe distant objects and to remember correctly a series of events to which the attention has been turned. The absurd contradictions in the reports of witnesses before the court provoked the psychological study of the ability for giving testimony. Thousands of experiments have been devoted to the question under the exact conditions of the laboratory experiment. We know now how misleading the reports of the most sincere witnesses may be, how illusions may slip in, in spite of the most serious intentions, how the subjective feeling of certainty may deceive them point for point, and, above all, how great the individual differences are in the faithfulness of mental reports. The sea-serpent stories of all regions have indicated how the sea is the most favorable background for the illusions of mental perception. We know from recent studies that, for instance, a quick succession of similar impressions produces a mutual inhibition through which some are eliminated from the range of our attention. The psychologist has found many such subtle traits of our attention which interfere with our observations, and if we think how much depends upon the observation of the naval officer on the commercial ship, as well as on the man-of-war, we can foresee that the time must come when the studies of the psychologist will not be ignored in the navy. Moreover, we find by experimental inquiry that the power of observation is dependent upon individual features, and that, accordingly, a man may be excellent in one kind of observation and entirely unreliable in another kind, in spite of his personal feeling that he is exerting an equal effort. These individual differences must be tested in order to find which man is particularly fit for a certain kind of observation and whose judgment is unreliable. Similar psychological tests would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be advisable for the spotter on the mast and for the men in many another position.

To illustrate these possibilities of psychological tests which may be applied in the interest of navigation, I may characterize at least one a little more in detail. The officer on the bridge may know exactly what he has to do under normal conditions and may be perfectly able to figure out carefully the right decision in case of an unusual, unexpected, complex situation, if he has plenty of time to judge on the relative value of the various factors involved. But the ultimate proof of the man comes when the unexpected happens and no time is left for the slow decision. A quick decision must be made or destruction of ship or life will follow. A vessel may suddenly loom up in the mist, or a rock or a wreck, and collision is inevitable unless the right actions are quickly chosen, and this means unless rapidly and yet correctly the comparative importance and insistence of the conditions are grasped. Only the man who can live up to this demand of an emergency is the born leader of a ship as far as mere navigation is concerned.

Experience for which mankind has dearly paid has shown that there are two types of men who utterly fail. One type becomes paralyzed under the pressure of the sudden responsibility. The feeling that a decision must be quickly reached inhibits in him every impulse to action, his mind comes to a standstill, before he reaches any decision at all the chances are gone, and the disaster can no longer be averted. The other type instantly opens the channels of motor discharge, but the flood of impulses rushes into any chance course and a haphazard result, a foolish decision, or an unconsidered hasty action is the outcome. The right man is of the third type, which, under the pressure of danger, without loss of time instinctively grasps the whole complex situation, is not carried away by any chance impression, does not overlook what is significant in the unexpected event, sees the important things great and the insignificant small. Coolly he chooses in immediate response the attitude which he would take if he had time for careful deliberation. Are we to wait until an emergency arises to find out whether the right type of personality is in command? May not the penalty of this postponement be measureless loss of valuable lives?

A leading ship company raised this neglected question

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recently with great earnestness and invited me as psychologist to consider whether our laboratory could not devise a scheme by which this ability to judge rapidly and yet correctly could be tested and measured. I tried many schemes, at first very complicated ones, but slowly I settled on an extremely simple device which brings out with surprising clearness the mental differences and the variations of those three types of behavior. The device looks like a little game. I use twenty-four cards, each of which contains four rows of twelve capital letters. They are all A's, E's, O's, and U's. Some of the cards contain twenty-one of one of the four letters and nine of each of the three others; some contain eighteen of the one and ten of each of the others; and some fifteen of the one and eleven of each of the three others. The letters are in entirely irrgular order and every card at the first glance looks almost bewildering. The task of the man to be tested is to stare at one card and to decide as quickly as possible which of the four letters is the most frequent one. It is evident that this is much more difficult if the most frequent letter occurs only fifteen times than when it occurs twenty-one times, but even in the latter case it is not easy to do it without any help by counting, for which, of course, no time is allowed. The full experiment consists in making this decision as quickly as possible for every one of the twenty-four cards, and the objective test is made by the demand that the subject of the experiment arrange the cards with the greatest possible speed in four piles: in the first those in which the A is predominant, in the second the E, in the third the O, and in the fourth the U. Then we measure the time from the signal to begin to the moment of laying down the last card, and afterward we count the number of times a card has been put in the wrong pile. Every mistake in the twenty-one letter cards counts four, in the eighteen letter cards three, in the fifteen letter cards one. If we sum up the mistakes and multiply by the number of seconds used, a product less than four hundred characterizes a man perfectly reliable in quick judgment of a complex situation, four hundred to a thousand normal, one thousand to two thousand fair, two thousand to three thousand doubtful, three thousand to five thousand poor, and over five thousand useless. Through a test which takes only a few minutes we thus arrive at a sorting of men according to their quickness or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sluggishness, deliberateness or inability to make a prompt decision. It is surprising how often men tested with this simple device confess that the result expresses exactly the experience which they have passed through when life called them to a sudden decision in an unexpected complex situation. Nevertheless, I am far from saying that the ideal of a test for this particular demand has been reached in this proposition. Still more suitable schemes may be invented in the future, but at least we no longer have any right to ignore the problem and to disregard the possibilities which experimental psychology offers, and to wait until the events of life carry on the experiments with disastrous results. For our purpose I have discussed this particular case only as an illustration of the method by which the experimental psychologist, with his miniature repetitions of life tasks, may seek the right man for the right place even on the bridge of the ship or in the crow's-nest or in the engine-room.

The officer in the navy, however, does not think primarily of those psychological features which are as important for the ocean greyhounds of the commercial fleet as for his ironclad floating fortresses. His interest naturally turns to those traits of the mind which are more directly connected with the success or failure in warfare. Hence let us consider that wide region of higher mental activities, the interplay of emotion and volition, judgment and imagination, intellect and instinct. But then we shall do best in our survey to discriminate between the minds of the officers and those of the crew. What are the mental characteristics of the many to whom the few have to give their orders? One psychological fact ought to stand in the foreground and ought never to be forgotten. The many are not simply a large number of single minds; they are not only many, but they are at the same time one. They are held together—more, they are forged together into one compact mental mass in which no single mind which entered has remained unchanged in its structure or in its energies. Let us by no means believe that this is only a metaphor or a picturesque expression which is to symbolize the fact that those hundreds of men have certain ideas or desires or emotions or feelings or prejudices or hopes or fears in common, and that the superior may simply rely on those common factors and, accordingly, ignore the individual differences among the men. Their unity is not a simple uniformity; their minds are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interrelated and not simply added to one another. Yet we must keep just as far from any reminiscences of popular mystical ideas, as if by a kind of telepathy one mind reaches out to another and fuses with it in a spiritual communion. Seen from a psychological standpoint, the personality is completely confined to the impressions, memories, imaginations, emotions, and volitions which originate in its own compass, and no mind can intrude into this mental individuality. Whatever comes to the individual mind from without must come through the senses in the form of impressions and sense perceptions. But when these impressions are perceptions not of the dead things around us, but of living beings animated by interests like ours and engaged in action with us, the impression influences the whole setting of the mind in one characteristic direction. The psychologist characterizes this as an increase of suggestibility. The particular man becomes more suggestible to all propositions which his senses receive from his companions. This psychophysical increase of suggestibility transforms the individuals now into a crowd, now into a rushing mob, now into an enthusiastic army, and whoever deals with such a group of men in which every one knows himself as a part of the cooperating whole must be fully aware of the advantages and of the dangers which are created by this reinforcement of suggestibility.

Suggestibility in the view of the modern psychologist means the readiness to accept suggestions, and suggestions are never anything but propositions for actions. In ordinary talk we speak of suggestions of ideas, but in a stricter sense this is misleading. Not the idea itself becomes the object of the suggestion, but either the proposition to act according to a certain idea or the proposition to believe in the reality of a certain idea. If we suggest the idea of a flower garden to a hypnotized man within the walls of his room, we do not simply awaken the imaginative idea before his mind. We might awake such an imaginative picture of a garden in any normal mind by speaking about it without hypnotism and without suggestion. What characterizes the abnormal state of the hypnotized man is that he is ready to accept the proposition that such a garden really surrounds him, and, accordingly, he begins to pick the roses from his chairs and tables. He accepts those ideas as real, and this is indeed ultimately nothing but an attitude, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his action an action of submission and of acknowledgment. All suggestions in this way refer to the inner or outer doings of men.

Now ordinarily, if we propose an action to our neighbor, the idea of the purpose may interest him, and if no objections arise in his mind and no impulses of his oppose, the idea of the action transforms itself into a real activity. But it may just as well happen that our proposition awakens in his mind the idea that the consequences of the action would be disagreeable, or that it would be useless or foolish or perhaps even criminal, or that he would be unable to carry it out, or that a risk would be connected with it, or that it would be against the rules, and any one of these associated ideas might overcome the impulse to carry out the proposition. He refuses to do what we invited him to undertake because the opposing idea proves to be the stronger. But the idea of an action may be proposed to us with such vividness and warmth, with such a striking tone of authority, or with such insistent persuasiveness, that all those resisting associations are suppressed and inhibited. The inner opposition is overwhelmed, the proposed action is carried out, and in the case that a proposition has such a power to inhibit the opposing ideas we call it suggestion. Yet this effect may result and does result still oftener from an inner state of the man. He may have come into a readiness to yield to propositions which he would otherwise resist, to perform acts which would normally appear to him silly or dangerous. This inner change is the increase of suggestibility. Emotional excitement, over-fatigue, certain drugs, produce this change. If the change reaches its maximum degree we call it hypnosis, as the hypnotic state is indeed nothing but highly increased suggestibility. But with normal men there is no more effective cause for the increase of suggestibility than the forming of a mass in which every one sees and knows that all the others share his fate, have the same to perform and to enjoy and to suffer. The children in a class, the laborers in a factory, the voters in a mass-meeting, the spectators on the bleachers at a game, the crowd assembled at a fire or an accident, form various types of such organized units held together by increased suggestibility, through which every single member is liable to act in a way which would be unnatural to him if he were alone. He may do acts or say things or risk

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dangers which he would fear if he stood by himself. He has not really become more courageous, but his increased suggestibility makes him imitative and ready to do what the others seem willing to do and to ignore the warning voice of his reason or his cowardice. He also becomes a little more foolish than he would be in isolation, he may shout words or indulge in actions which would appear to him silly or inconsiderate if he were alone; but the crowd consciousness has control of him; he has become insensitive to the opposing voice of wisdom. He laughs where he would never laugh alone; he runs away where his normal instincts would teach him to hold on; he gets discouraged or excited where the cold facts would not warrant either. The mass can hold his mind down to a level far below its true nature and can lift it up to a height which it could never reach unsupported.

Among all lasting conditions of human life, no one seems more predisposed to create this increased suggestibility of a mass than the life on a war-ship. Every man on board feels how his fate is bound up with that of all the others. He knows that they all are detached for months and years from the life of the millions; they feel the same pulse of the engines; they are lifted by the same waves; they know that the same danger would threaten all of them. The individual has given up a part of his possibilities. If the hour of a battle were to come, every man knows that for him no individual rushing forward is possible, as for the soldiers on the battle-field. He cannot escape the ship which carries them all and with which they all will sink if it goes to the bottom. A closer union of a multitude of strangers cannot be imagined; the suggestibility must, therefore, be tremendously increased, and that means that the powers of the man are reinforced for good or for evil, that his individual resistance to the imitative impulses is decreased, and that he has become to a certain degree a passive instrument for the will of the leader. No superior can fail to make the fullest use of this power and to be aware of the lurking dangers. He must know that this increased suggestibility could be the condition for a panic among men no single one of whom would be frightened. But at the same time he can rely on it that this suggestibility will insure an enthusiastic and heroic fight if the right impulse and the right start are given, and that every single man may then be carried far

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beyond the range of his individual spontaneity. As to the technical side of this control of the mass, one rule may be immediately deduced from these psychological principles.

If crowd consciousness is really only increased suggestibility, and suggestibility is only readiness to act according to a proposition, it will be of utmost importance to give the signal for any turn of mind by an impulse to real action. Do not try to awaken any ideas or conceptions or judgments, but release an action in the right direction by forcing any one man to carry it out, or, better still, by making the movement yourself, and you have won your case. One forward movement bears the whole mass forward, one backward movement ruins all. Even if you only go through the motions of an action to give an illusory suggestion of it which would not convince the individual, it will carry away the excited mass.

This suggestibility of the social group which composes the crew stands in an especially significant relation to the mental function which, after all, is the backbone of military service—obedience. Where the spirit of discipline is lacking, the military cause is lost. There never has been a victorious navy without obedience. To a certain degree the necessity of a dogged submission to the order has in the most modern ship become still more necessary than ever before, because the individual man is more isolated in his duties than in former times. He does not know what is going on in the battle; he does not see the others; he cannot understand the situation; he cannot lose a moment of time to find out what is going on; he simply has to obey his orders as long as life flickers in his soul. He cannot even be trained for this obedience in the hour of battle, because all training and all exercises and all manœuvers necessarily eliminate the mental factor which is ultimately the most important in the hour of the real fight, the emotion of fear. Whether the man will carry out the movements which the manœuver has taught when the cannons not only are thundering, but the balls really are splintering the ship, depends upon the one decisive question of whether an obedient submission to the order of the superior has become an instinct for his mind.

And here begins that complex relation to the suggestibility of the crew, inasmuch as the spirit of obedience itself is reinforced by the unified social consciousness of the mass,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while, on the other hand, the obedient carrying out of the order disturbs the social consciousness. I say the spirit of obedience is in itself fostered by the increased suggestibility with its imitativeness. To be obedient is the common function of all the men. They feel themselves as parts of that one unified organic fighting-machine which can fulfil its purpose only if strict discipline controls it, and the willingness to submit therefore becomes infectious. Hence the order of the commander is the highest duty for every one, and that contagious, imitative enthusiasm for the common cause against the enemy in every individual takes the form of an unquestioning spirit of subordination. The officer can, therefore, expect a much greater spirit of obedience from a member of that socialized group than from any single individual. But, on the other hand, the order goes from the commander to the man directly, and he has to fulfil his share without reference to what the other members of the crew have to do. To demand obedience to the order which is given to him individually may mean to force on him resistance to the suggestions of the social consciousness. Indeed, it is no real obedience unless it is strong enough to break up the unified will of the crowd. In this sense their education toward obedience demands a relentless suppression of the general suggestibility. The men must be trained by real discipline to have control of themselves in spite of all suggestions of their mates and to inhibit in their minds all merely imitative and yielding impulses. The psychologist knows no other way of training such a power of self-control but by a persistent strengthening and disciplining of the attention and the will.

We all know how much this self-discipline is weakened by the corrupting indulgence with which our modern age coddles the youth. We know how a pseudo-education which is controlled by fads and fancies fosters those go-as-you-please methods which yield to the whims and likings of the petted boys and girls, and how this pampered youth learns an abundance of scattered bits of knowledge, but fails to learn what alone makes life worth living, the power of attention and will which enforces the dutiful action against all temptations. The result is the superficiality of our public life with the lack of resistance to sensational and hysterical influences. Our whole modern world instinctively longs again for thoroughness and discipline and the teaching of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obedience. But the army and navy at least never lessen the firm grip of authority, and every officer ought to understand the mental conditions under which discipline can be developed. One psychological consideration must stand in the foreground. Discipline is the product of habit, and habit cannot become deep-rooted where any exceptions are admitted. Habits result from the physiological law that the uninterrupted repetition of actions transforms the nervous path into a path of less and less resistance. The submission to the order given and the faithful performance of the duty, in spite of all counter-stimulations, must be secured by such habituation of the brain paths. We cannot expect that the man will be always ready to play the hero and to force his energies to a maximum and to make great sacrifices in order to be obedient. The routine effect of a strong discipline can be reached only if this submission has become so habitual that it works as a matter of course without any need of excessive effort. The service must have made the man an exact machine which works automatically whenever the order reaches his consciousness.

Yet the true meaning of military discipline would be entirely missed if automatic obedience were considered as the only important demand, and if another postulate were neglected which stands in every respect co-ordinate, the demand for a spirit of initiative. Without this spirit the fighter would become a slave, and no nation can rely on its moral slaves. Initiative does not stand in a psychological contradiction to obedience. On the contrary, even the training in obedience demands a background of initiative, as the overcoming of the resistance will be successful only if every single act of submission is supported by a feeling of confidence and reliance in the leader, and this reliance, however much it may result from the imitative crowd consciousness, remains ultimately an act of personality and initiative.

But the spontaneity which the service has to develop in every man must go far beyond this mere internal free option for a leader. The commander controls a well-disciplined crew only if he can know that every man is ready to give orders to himself in the spirit of the whole when orders from above are lacking. Every man in the crew must be able and must be conscious of his ability to step into a position of responsibility. His intelligence and power of decision, accordingly, demand as much stimulation as his habit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of submission. It is this which ennobles the modern navy and gives to it values far beyond those of a mere mechanical fighting-machine. The idea is wide-spread that different views are possible on this question, that some navies do not believe in the initiative of the individuals because they are afraid that it will interfere with obedience and that the automatic machine-like functioning of the crew ought to be the ideal. For instance, it is a wide-spread belief among the officers of the American navy that this contrast of view characterizes the difference between the American and the German navy, the Americans believing in the spirit of initiative, the Germans in the spirit of obedience. Would it not be misleading to awaken the impression that an American naval officer undervalues the importance of obedience? After a serious study of this problem with reference to the German navy, I feel convinced that it is equally misleading to fancy that the leading men of the German navy believe less in the absolute value of the spirit of initiative in the navy than the Americans. I should rather say that the development of the last twenty years, as it is reflected in the German navy literature and in the spirit of the German navy officers, finds its real center in the persistent effort to create a strong sense of initiative and of individual responsibility and personal freedom in every man who is to fight on board of the cruiser. Initiative and obedience ought to belong together in the psychology of the naval man the world over.

We have spoken so far only of the psychology which the officer ought to know in order to understand his subordinates, but we have not spoken of the psychology of the officer himself. What are the significant features of his mind? To a certain degree, to be sure, he is not only in the same boat; he is also of the same mold of mind as the crew. He too is a part of that compact unity with its social consciousness and its increased suggestibility, sharing the common enthusiasm and sharing the common fears; and, above all, he too must combine the spirit of obedience with the spirit of initiative, however much the obedience is shaded into an intelligent carrying out of instructions as against the mechanical fulfilment of orders, and the initiative is heightened to a sense of responsibility toward every man on board and toward the nation. But in so far as the officer stands detached from the crew the mental character-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

istics which are necessary for him are to a high degree dependent upon those psychological conditions of the crew. If the men are a suggestible mass, it is he who needs the power of suggestion. He must train in himself and develop to highest efficiency that unwavering firmness which overwhelms an easily impressed crowd and forces on it the will of the leader. If the officer shows signs of hesitation and of weak willingness to yield, lack of determination, or erratic fluctuation, his influence is paralyzed. Only the man of suggestive power can stop a panic by one short word or one vivid movement and by a gesture can transform fear into daring courage. Such suggestive power must draw its strength from auto-suggestion. An officer who allows himself to grow tired by the monotony of the service or by the exhausting work on board, or who becomes nervous or fussy or irritated, or who instinctively shrinks from the responsibility and always waits for the counsel of others, slowly loses the auto-suggestive hold on himself which is even more important than any knowledge. Whatever he can do to strengthen his nervous system, to enrich his intellect, to widen his horizon, to keep his instincts vigorous and his imagination vivid, his inspirations high, and his will decisions quick, all ought to contribute to that reliance on himself which strengthens the power of his auto-suggestive thought. Only then is he a true commander and leader. The difficulties which he has to overcome are multifold, as the conditions and the strain of the service work strongly toward automatization of his mental life, and this involves a weakening of that power of command with its independent self-reliance and its need for inexhaustible auto-suggestion. He has to overcome the resistance by sport and training, by social comraderie with his equals, by joy in the service as such, by intellectual interest in his duties, and by passionate love for his task; but, above all, by a systematic training of his will power.

This emphasis on the emotional traits of the leader does not contradict the demand which seems paramount in a war college, the training of abilities. However much an officer may have learned concerning ships and guns and ammunition, and even concerning the history of warfare, the knowledge alone does not prepare him for the great work which he is called to perform for the good of the nation in peace and in war. The development of abilities such as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have to be shown in the movements of the fleet or in the battle is dependent upon mental activities for which no mere knowledge can be substituted. They stand much nearer to art than to knowledge. We find this contrast in every field of human interests. The youngest pupil in a school has to gather some information and has to learn facts accessible to knowledge, and, on the other hand, has to win and exercise abilities. His power to read or to write or to calculate demands actual performance and can never be gained by mere theoretical demonstration. This doubleness remains the same through all stages of schooling up to the highest technical and professional preparations for life-work. The surgeon must learn his knowledge of medicine and exercise his ability to perform the operation. Yet these abilities which have to be acquired are acts of our minds and nervous systems. It is not necessary to train them on exactly those objects for which they are finally to be used. The only essential requirement is that really the same mental and physiological functions be involved which are needed in the decisive hour. To go through a real battle would be an impossible preparation. To go through a manœuver is, of course, only an approach, as every sham battle leaves out the real hatred of the enemy and therefore changes the final mental situation. But even such manœuvers with actual ships go far beyond what the routine training can bring to the individual officer. Hence he is obliged to reduce the mental situation still more and to substitute a naval-war game and the mastery of theoretical naval-war problems of actual warfare for the genuine fight. But if these miniature battles and these schematized wars of the college-room are well arranged, they can become a substitute in which the most essential mental functions of warfare are actually exercised.

The psychologist cannot too earnestly advise that emphasis be laid on such practical exercises. The training in all our technical activities from writing with a pen to mastering a musical instrument or a scientific apparatus demonstrates in ever new forms that the mere ability to go through the component acts of a complex action is not sufficient to guarantee success in the complex action itself. We must always consider the synthesizing of the part actions as a task in itself, which needs independent training. An officer may have learned to do this and to do that and to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

respond to one condition in this and to another condition in that way, but he can never feel himself prepared for the right decision and right performance in the unified complex situation of the battle if he has not thoroughly trained himself in responding to the whole complexity of the situation. In every complex activity the whole is endlessly more than the mere sum of the parts, and that is the necessary result of the structure of our psychophysical system. The various layers of psychophysical units, one higher than another, have to take charge of the organization of our motor responses. In the first few weeks the man who is learning telegraphy only tries to give the signals for the single letters as quickly as possible, and the curve of his speed shows a steady ascent until he knows how to produce the single letters with the greatest possible speed. Then he reaches a period of standstill, until he is fully trained in this elementary ability, but afterward he enters into the second stage of training and learns to telegraph not letters, but whole words, and his speed in telegraphy quickly rises. In this second period he learns to synthesize the motor impulses for the single letters into complex movement innervations for whole words. This new ability is acquired after several months and then begins again a time of standstill. Finally he reaches the period of acquiring the highest ability, not accessible to every one—namely, the synthesizing of the word impulses into still more complex activities in which one motor stroke gives the impulse for the telegraphing of a whole phrase composed of several words. In this way the officer must learn to synthesize the thousand partial activities which he has learned as factors of the naval service. He needs exercise in that whole very complex setting from which the special actions then spring with automatic necessity.

While in this way ability must be developed in addition to mere knowledge, it is not fair to underestimate the knowledge. There are some who claim that such ability is instinct and that instinctive activities are essentially dependent upon inborn powers. The right commander sees by an intuition what he must do in the decisive moment. He has not even time to consider deliberately what possibilities are open, but with instinctive certainty he chooses the right one. This is perfectly true and yet entirely false. What we call our instinct in such cases is not an inborn disposition like that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for satisfying hunger or thirst; it is nothing but an ability to respond to the complex stimulus without a conscious awareness of the special steps which lead to the end. But in order to gain such an instinctive ability the connections must have been formed by persistent exercises into which perfectly conscious intentions and careful knowledge and learning have entered. The piano virtuoso plays without being conscious of the particular movements which at first had to be slowly learned. We all write and we all speak instinctively without choosing the special words or the special writing movements, but we had to learn them by slow study. Everything which we acquire through assiduous learning to-day has a chance of being transformed to-morrow into instinctive behavior which serves the ends without our being conscious of the steps which lead to them. It is a kind of mental abbreviation, a short cut which can never be reached without industry and patience. The officer who devotes faithful years of study, perhaps to the history of naval warfare, and earnestly thinks himself into the situation of every decisive battle, forms connections in his mind between the ideas of certain situations and the ideas of certain necessary responses and reactions which slowly become part of his instinctive behavior and actions.

We have said that every pupil in a school and every student in a profession has to learn knowledge and has to acquire abilities. But the aim of education could never be reached by those two ways alone. A third factor is necessary to complete the meaning of the school. Interests must be stimulated. Knowledge and abilities would be dead and useless unless a living interest stood behind them. Even the smallest child must have at least the interest of curiosity or of sympathy, and on a higher level we stimulate the logical and ethical and esthetic interests in order to prepare the youth for a valuable life-work. The interest which leads the scholar is not that which stimulates the artist, and the interest which guides the physician is not that which moves the lawyer, and the interest which inspires the minister is not that which controls the statesman. But there is no calling, high or humble, in which an emotional interest does not give force and meaning to the knowledge and abilities of the man. The knowledge and the ability of the naval officer, the one resulting from the intellectual functions of his mind, the other from the volitional powers of his mind,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would indeed be deprived of their real efficiency and value unless a strong, deep stream of interest flowed from the emotions of his mind.

These interests may be of many kinds. But it holds true of every vocation that many motives are intertwined in the mind. The surgeon is anxious to receive his fees in order to earn his livelihood, and this mercenary motive is combined with the social one of his ambition to have a respected name in the community for his professional work, and both motives are combined with the intellectual one of a serious interest in the scientific problems of his medical work; and yet even these three groups of motives would never make him a true physician and would never inspire him enough for the great task which he may have to perform at a bedside if there were not the ethical motive of the desire to help suffering mankind. In a similar way we may disentangle personal and social and idealistic motive elements in every vocation, but in none does their co-operation seem more important than in the mental structure of the naval officer. Of course there must be personal motives involved. The officer must think of earning his livelihood, of filling an honorable position, of advancing as quickly as possible in his career. But motives on a much higher level, motives which do not refer to the individual as such, but to ideal aims and purposes, must be intimately associated with the personal ones. He must feel joy in the service as such; he must have interest in the details of the work and in the problems which it offers; he must be determined by a consciousness of duty which gives him perfect satisfaction when he is loyal to his task, whatever sacrifices it may demand. Yet here again we must insist that even all these motives of a higher order are not sufficient to guarantee the ideal perfection of the officer's achievement. There must be one motive which is still deeper-rooted and which lies far beyond mere personal consideration.

What is needed as the central energy in the mind of the naval officer is an enthusiastic belief in the ideal value of the navy and the task of the navy. The teacher can never give his best if he is not inspired by the ideal belief in the incomparable value of educating the youth. The artist and the scholar cannot create works of lasting glory if they do not live in an unquestioning belief in the sacred mission of beauty and truth. The minister cannot be a true preacher

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if pure religion is not the center of his soul. Such a belief, such an inspiration, such a religion, must penetrate and fill the mind of the officer. With every fiber of his personality he must feel that it is sacred work to which he is called, that the mission of the navy is an ideal one, and that the honor of the country is not too dearly paid for by his death.

The psychologist sees in all these demands for the highest unselfish motives, not simply beautiful phrases and romantic illusions. Even though he abstracts from the higher moral aspect and simply takes the standpoint of description and explanation, he must acknowledge that such an emotional belief is the strongest reservoir of the energies for psychophysical action. The teacher and the minister, the artist and the scholar, and with them the officer, may perform every single activity which is needed for their life-work by the mere interplay of ideas, by learning and training. But in every case the available power for activity would easily be exhausted. Any friction would interfere with the possible success, any selfish desire would inhibit the impulses, fatigue would weaken the work, chance distractions and temptations would lead to side activities. Wherever one great emotional motive synthesizes the life-work, the psychophysical energy can overcome those frictions and those temptations, those selfish motives, those difficulties and dangers. This is true of the mind of the masses as well as of the individual. The maximum effort and the faithful endurance through the hour of danger presuppose that high-pitched tension for which mere intellectual processes can never be a substitute. The psychologist, therefore, without any emotionalism on his part, but for strictly scientific reasons, must demand that every factor be inhibited which interferes with a whole-hearted surrender to the sacredness of the naval cause.

The daily routine work may easily be carried on by officers and men who lack this belief, and the smoothness of their performance may deceive the world concerning the perfunctory character of their service. The interference with this ultimately decisive attitude may result from many conditions. Among the bluejackets a great mental inhibition may come from the tendency to change the vocation. English observers seem to believe that here lies the central mental difficulty of the American navy, since it must be acknowledged that in no other country are the rank and file

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the population so easily inclined to change from one vocation to another. The minds of the officers, on the other hand, are perhaps most easily harmed by what has often been called the spirit of the steam-yachtsman. The steam-yachtsman danger is, psychologically, especially grave, because it so easily creeps in without at first allowing any one to perceive the difference between the right and the wrong attitude. The steam-yachtsman loves the ship and its handling, enjoys the life on the water, is deeply interested in all naval movements; and yet the whole setting of his mind is fundamentally wrong for the officer who has to prepare himself and his men for the heroic work in the crisis. It is a spirit of ease and comfort, of charming hospitality and delightful companionship, of self-satisfaction and good-natured sportsmanship. In many a foreign navy the true believers in sea power, therefore, dislike to see too many rich officers in the service, as their spirit of comfort and relaxation spreads far too much this steam-yachtsman attitude. There are not a few who believe that this difference alone was the real reason for the victory of the Japanese navy, in which such a steam-yachtsman element does not exist, over the Russian navy, in which it is said to be widespread.

But the social psychologist cannot overlook a still more dangerous rock which is threatening under the surface. The whole civilized world to-day is filled not only with the old vague wish for peace, but with a more modern conviction that means can be found to secure peace and to make war superfluous. The American nation is among the leaders in this international movement, and no educated man has a right to close his eyes to this tremendous problem of civilization. But just because it is appealing to an ideal demand and carries with it the promise of highest humanity, it is much more dangerous to the inner unity of the officer's mind than a mere appeal to comfort and selfishness. The mind of the warrior is thrown into a conflict between the demands of his life-work and the siren voices of the eternal peace advocates. How can the enthusiastic belief in the preparedness for war and in the relentlessness of the fight prevail in a mind which is touched by the doubt whether war among civilized nations is not brutal and immoral and criminal? It is one of the most important conditions for the success of the navy that such inner wavering be absolutely excluded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the officer's mind. He is not for that purpose obliged to fall back to a barbaric hatred of the enemy with the mere longing to kill, nor has he to narrow his horizon and ignorantly to ignore these international peace movements. All that is needed is for him to see them in the right perspective. He will not deny the harm and the losses which war brings with it. But at the same time he will be deeply impressed by the tremendous moral power of a national self-defense which concentrates the energies of the whole nation in loyalty to its historical mission. He must grasp the fundamental rôle of war in the history of mankind as the great vehicle of progress, as the great eradicator of egotism, as the great educator to a spirit of sacrifice and duty.

Moreover, he must recognize how the state forms in which mankind has developed have been bound up with national rivalry and war and how our present age, in spite of its palace of international arbitration at The Hague, seems further removed from warlessness than many a previous period. And as soon as he has recognized that war **is** necessary and as soon as he has chosen to serve the nation in its military work, no argument against war ought to interfere with the unified setting of his loyal mind. A scholar may be convinced that the poet's imagination is a noble gift for the artist; and yet he must not allow himself to be carried away or even to be touched by this longing for imaginative flight when he is in the path of scholarship. The minister may be convinced that there is high value in the materialistic work of the naturalist; and yet his religious attitude must not be shaken by the demand for a godless universe. The ideals of the artist and of the scholar and of the preacher, of the peace reformer and of the warrior, are all true ideals, are each worthy to give meaning and significance to the life which is devoted to them.

But this significance and this meaning ultimately lie in devotion, and the deepest value is therefore lost if the faithful belief in any one of these ideals is choked by rival ideals. There is no fitness to win without unity of mind and certainty of purpose.

HUGO MÜNSTERBERG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

BY A. MAURICE LOW

II

HOW THE WORKING-MAN WOULD SUFFER IF THE STATE EMPLOYED ALL LABOR

It was said in the previous article that there are two kinds of Socialists: the evolutionary or scientific, who believes in peaceful and lawful means to accomplish his ends and bring about the socialization of the State; and the revolutionary, who openly advocates violence and the use of any means that will make possible the ideal State as he conceives it. Yet while Socialists of different kinds employ different methods their purpose is the same.

It is easier to discuss the programme of the revolutionary than the evolutionary Socialist, for the former has at least the courage boldly to avow what he wants and the way he would go about to get it. The evolutionary Socialist, on the other hand, is more cautious and clouds his ideas with words without being able to make the average person seeking information understand what he wants or how it can be procured. If one attempts to pin down an evolutionary Socialist to a clear explanation of his purposes and the means to be employed one is very apt to receive this answer:

"Socialists are constantly confronted with a demand for a detailed description of the Socialist society of the future. This it is impossible to give, since all the forces which make for social change cannot be known. Any such prediction would necessarily be pure Utopian romance."

This is a passage from Spargo and Arner's *Elements of Socialism,* and Spargo is one of the leaders of evolutionary Socialism in this country. Remarking parenthetically that the whole doctrine of Socialism is "pure Utopian romance," it will be seen how difficult it is to combat a cause whose leaders are content to rely on generalities, yet out of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mass of literature on the subject one may obtain a fairly satisfactory idea of the aims of the evolutionary Socialist. "The statement that Socialists work for the owning of the means of production by the community and the means of consumption by the individuals represents fairly enough their practical aim." This is the concise definition of Graham Wallas, an English Socialist of standing. The main object of the Socialistic attack, says Sydney Olivier, another equally distinguished English Socialist, is "that element in our private property system" the "individual ownership of the instruments of production, land, and capital." Sidney Webb says that "the political economist now knows that with free competition and private property in land and capital, no individual can possibly obtain the full result of his own labor. The student of industrial development, moreover, finds it steadily more and more impossible to trace what is precisely the result of each man's separate toil." Sydney Olivier further observes:

"The livelihood of the typical proletarian is earned by the exercise of his faculties for useful activity; the livelihood of the typical capitalist, or owner of property, is obtained, without any contribution of his or her activity, in the form of a pension called rent, interest, or dividend guaranteed by law out of the wealth produced from day to day by the activities of the proletariat."

I shall ask the reader to read carefully the foregoing passage because in half a dozen lines it is the whole case of Socialism against the rights of property and industry. It is the foundation on which Socialism rests. It is the attempt to create the belief that the so-called "capitalist" is a leech, a parasite, a social excrescence, an utterly useless creature who is responsible for everything that is bad and for all the evils of which society complains. Again and again Socialists assert that the capitalist grows fat on the blood sucked from the "typical proletarian" who alone performs "useful activity." That this belief is both false and fallacious will be demonstrated.

The object for which the evolutionary Socialist is working is to abolish private capital and private ownership so as to transfer both capital and ownership, the means of production as well as the means of consumption, from the hands of the individual to those of the community—that is, the State at large, using the word State, of course, not in the restricted sense of a subordinate political division, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the whole nation, that entity which we indiscriminately but conveniently call the Government or the people. If Socialism were a fact and not merely an impossible theory, the individual ownership of farms or houses would be prohibited and they would all be owned by the State for the common use. No private person would be permitted to have capital—that is, the capital he may save from his earnings by the exercise of thrift or self-denial, his ingenuity or ability, as the activities for which capital is employed would be in the hands of the State.

Let us take a concrete example. There would be no private bakers, but there would be bakers in every hamlet and village and city appointed by the State who would bake, not the kind of bread that an individual wanted, but the bread provided for in the regulations approved by the Secretary of State or the functionary charged with the duty of superintending the making and baking of several million loaves of bread every morning in the year. For it must be apparent to every one, even to the person who has given the most indifferent thought to the question now that his attention is called to it, that if the State took over the whole operation of making bread it would have to be systematized and regulated or the people would go without bread. As private bread-making for sale would be declared illegal, just as now no one except the Government is permitted to mint coins or to print dollar bills or make postage stamps, Government bakeries would have to be established, each in charge of a manager or a superintendent, the employees appointed by the Government, their hours of labor and duties regulated by the Government, the materials purchased by the Government, the number, size, and quality of the loaves prescribed by the Government. Obviously the manager in charge of a Government bakery at Painted Post, Arkansas, let us say, would be permitted no more discretion than the superintendent in charge of a branch mint, who turns out the coins he is directed by the Secretary of the Treasury. There would, of course, be a bread standard, just as now there is a coin standard. By Act of Congress or the referendum or the recall or some other device the standard loaf of bread in the United States would be made of wheat flour because the majority of the people eat bread made of wheaten flour; the dough, according to the formula, would be mixed at a certain hour throughout the United States;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it would be put in the oven on schedule time; the loaves would be taken out as directed by the regulations. It would be the boast of the American that whether in Painted Post or New York, in New Orleans or in a mining-camp that has sprung into existence overnight, his loaf of bread would be made of the same materials, it would weigh the same, it would cost the same and taste the same. There in a sentence is the effect of Socialism. It would result in monotony; it would destroy initiative; it would offer no premium to ability.

Lest I be charged with unfairness, let us examine into the matter more in detail. With the standard loaf of bread established by the Government, the sole duty of the Government baker would be to turn out his loaves according to the Government formula. When enterprise is in the hands of private individuals there is always an incentive to the individual to do his work a little better than his rival, for if he makes a better article than a competitor his trade increases, which means he makes more money. A Government employee has no such incentive. He has no share in the profits (of course under Socialism there would be no profits), he gains no personal credit. He simply does what is required of him; nothing more.

There is another way by which the general public would be injured if the baking of bread was a Government function. An enterprising baker bakes bread for profit and is continually trying to see how he can enlarge his trade by catering to the public taste. He conceives the idea, let us say, that if he uses more or less yeast, or yeast made according to his own receipt, he will have a loaf that will be pleasing to some people; not to all, but to a certain number. Whereupon he experiments, wasting a great deal of dough and money, until he finds the exact proportions, discovering that the loaves must be baked a little more or less than the ordinary loaf and the temperature of the oven must be changed; but at last his experiments are successful, and he is able to produce the perfected loaf and is in his small way a benefactor and properly entitled to his reward.

Under State control there would be no experimenting because no one would be sufficiently interested to try experiments, and if some one was ingenious enough to think of a new way to make bread and suggested it to the Government official in charge of the baking establishment he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be told that the idea was absurd, for it is notorious that Government officials, once they get into a rut, strive by every means in their power to keep there. If the ingenious individual is persistent enough and is inspired with the zeal of the reformer or the pertinacity of the crank, he may, perhaps, in time secure from Congress an appropriation for experimenting; and many years after all the rest of the non-socialistic world has been enjoying better or more nutritious bread it will be made possible for Americans to have it.

I shall, perhaps, be told that I am not fair, that there will be a Government laboratory for experimentation where scientists will spend their entire time searching not only to add a new flavor to bread, but also how to cheapen its cost and improve its qualities. Very true, but what is one or even half a dozen laboratories compared to the hundreds of thousands of bakeries where practical men, even if they are not scientists, every day have the highest personal incentive to make a better or a more delectable loaf? It is that personal incentive that has made progress, that enables the poorest of to-day to be so much better and cheaper clothed and fed and housed than the richest of a past generation. Governments do not invent or discover or build. States do not experiment or take large risks with capital in the hope of cheapening production. It is not the unselfish Socialist or the unpractical Utopian who has reduced the cost of manufacture by the fraction of a cent, but it is Sydney Olivier's "typical capitalist" who has turned the darkness of night into day so that the "typical proletarian" may live in decency and comfort.

I have used bread as an illustration of what we may expect when Socialism is instituted because the making of bread is one of the simplest manufacturing operations and also because the use of bread is universal. We can manage to get along without jam or Panama hats, but bread in some form or other every one must have. We have already seen that if the State took over the bakeries there would have to be a tremendous army of State bakery employees appointed simply to turn the flour into loaves, but that, of course, would only be a detachment of the army. There would have to be shops for the sale of bread, salesmen, cashiers, bookkeepers, delivery men, horses and wagons or motor-trucks. There would be inspectors to see that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subordinates were properly doing their duty and the Government was not defrauded, for even among Socialists there would be some bad and dishonest men; there would be auditors and clerks and accountants to examine the returns so as to assure the people that their money was not improperly expended. Does any sane person believe that under this system the price of a loaf of bread would be reduced by the infinitesimal fraction of a cent? Does not every person of intelligence see that the only result of the socialization of bread-making would be to increase the price of the loaf of bread without in any way increasing its size or improving its quality?

The very men who most loudly demand Socialism because they claim they are now "exploited" by private capital and, therefore, denied a fair return for their labor are those who would be most injuriously affected if Socialism was put into operation. Under the existing system of industrialism, it is possible for the journeyman baker to become a boss baker, to rise from the ranks of the employee into those of the employer, if he is industrious, saving, and has intelligence; and, as every one knows, there are bakers and plumbers and carpenters—men, in fact, in every trade and walk in life, who, beginning the struggle for existence without advantage and influence and with only their hands and their brains as their capital, have risen by their own endeavor; some to comfort, some to affluence, some to high position. In the ranks of industrialism the baton of the field marshal is at the bottom of every recruit's knapsack, although not every one has the wit to find it. But it is there, and that is the incentive to hard work, to decent living, to the exercise of man's reasoning faculties. That is the reward to which every apprentice may aspire; but what would be his reward if the State took over all industry? Assuming an absolutely honest civil service where there is no favoritism, where influence counts for naught and merit is the sole test—an ideal state of affairs not impossible of realization, but practically almost so—the faithful, diligent, and intelligent Government servant would slowly gain his promotion and might hope, after long years of service, to reach the highest rung in the ladder—an agency or the management of an important bakery. But he would always remain a hired man, a servant of the State. Socialism would mean implanting upon Western civilization the debasing and in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jurious effects of the caste system of the East. A man would be born a baker and die a baker; in all probability the son would follow in the footsteps of the father, and there would be a caste of bakers in America just as there is a caste of offal collectors in India. I take it this phase of Socialism has not been considered by the working-man, and I believe that the average American working-man is too intelligent and too ambitious to surrender the hope of reward for the dubious benefit of becoming a barnacle of the State, especially as the first and most marked effect of Socialism would be to increase the cost of all commodities without conferring any corresponding benefit.

Socialism on the high scale that would be necessary if in this country the Government took over all the bake-shops has never been tested; but it has been tried on a smaller scale, and the result was so disastrous that it showed what the consequences would be were the people mad enough to permit the Socialists to wreck the country.

In 1848 the French Provisional Government, in fulfilment of its promise to provide work for all who claimed it, established *ateliers nationaux,* or national workshops, which was coming very close to the realization of the Socialistic dream. A great establishment for the manufacture of clothing was set up in Paris. The Government provided the buildings rent free and furnished the working capital, charging no interest. It gave an immediate order for 25,000 uniforms for the National Guard and promised further orders so as to keep the plant in operation and agreed to pay the same price as private contractors asked, eleven francs per uniform. Fifteen hundred men were put to work, to whom the Government advanced daily two francs a day as "subsistence money" pending a final division of the profits. When the accounts came to be squared it was found that instead of profits there was a loss and that the two francs a day paid to the workmen as subsistence money worked out as the equivalent of sixteen francs for a uniform instead of eleven, the price by private contract; while the "subsistence money," which was only another term for wages, of two francs a day was less than that which journeymen tailors earned in private employ. Summed up, this was the result of the experiment: The Government paid five francs more for a uniform than if it had bought in the open market besides losing the amount invested in the plant and the inter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

est on the money advanced, while the working-men received lower wages than private employers paid. A great many employers were ruined by the competition of the State and much distress followed. As usual, the working-man was the chief sufferer.

Why was the experiment a failure? According to contemporary accounts, it failed chiefly because *incentive was destroyed.* The scheme contemplated an equal division of the profits among the 1,500 men employed, but as each man was working not for himself, but for all the others, no man thought it necessary to put forward his full energy, as the others would make up for his dishonesty; and as every man conceived the same selfish idea the daily output was reduced and the cost of manufacturing necessarily increased; for, as every one knows, the smaller the production the greater the cost. Socialists are very fond of saying that Socialism will put an end to selfishness. That is all very fine as a phrase, but is it truth? Is an intelligent, conscientious Socialist working at his loom eight hours a day and turning out so many yards of cloth content to receive no higher wages than the man at the next loom, who, because he is unintelligent or a shirker, turns out only half the number of yards of cloth? The answer is to be found in the actions of the Socialists themselves whenever there is a dispute between masters and working-men over wages.

Perhaps a thousand years hence, when human nature has become so refined that selfishness no longer exists and individuals are born with a conscience instead of conscience being a cultivated virtue, the joy of labor, of which the poets sing so blithely, may be all that is necessary for each man to give the best that is in him for the benefit of all others. We have not yet reached the ideal State, and until we do selfishness will continue to be a greater force than altruism, and the hope of reward will be the motive to make each man exert himself to the utmost. Take away incentive and little is left. That is what Socialism would do. It would destroy incentive. Instead of men doing their best, they would be content to do only merely sufficient to enable them to earn their daily subsistence.

A. Maurice Low.

(To be Continued)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHINA'S REVOLUTION AND ITS EFFECT

BY CHING-CHUN WANG

A LITTLE more than a year ago the world was shaken by the guns at Wu Chang, which were opened upon the imperial troops of the Manchu Dynasty. Ever since we have been surprised and astonished again and again by the kaleidoscopic changes taking place in China. The revolution, which was at first looked upon as a farce and then feared as a sure prelude to general lawlessness, prolonged chaos, and wholesale bloodshed, has within the amazingly short time of a quarter of a year retired one of the oldest monarchies in the world to its proper place in history and opened up a new era of freedom and prosperity for a quarter of the whole human race; and all this has been done with a moderation unique and unparalleled in the history of nations. Therefore, China's revolution has been rightly called the great miracle of the twentieth century.

But this bloodless and marvelously speedy revolution was not the result of a transient passion. It was the natural outcome of a long-cherished desire for a broad-based freedom making for lasting contentment and uninterrupted progress. Ever since the Chino-Japanese War of 1895 there has grown a conviction that the Imperial Government was inefficient, corrupt, and incurable. The idea of love of country and the latent spirit of patriotism, which had lain dormant for ages, gradually revived in the hearts of the Chinese people. They began to notice China's unenviable position and to feel where she should and could be. This consciousness of the sacred love of one's fatherland, once awakened, immediately began to grow. Thus we saw the efforts of the young reformers of 1898, heartlessly frustrated by the merciless hands of the late Empress Dowager, with the summary execution and permanent exile of scores of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brightest young men in the country. This act of the Manchu Government once more set back the hands of the clock of progress and continued their reactionary programme. But the blood of these martyrs seemed to have only fertilized the soil for renewed efforts; and repeated attempts at reform were made from time to time even at the risk of loss of life.

The astute Empress and her advisers, however, were blind to the wish of the people and the need of the country. Instead of heeding the cry of their subjects and of learning a lesson from our sad experience, they continued their suicidal policy of suppressing individual qualities and national aspirations. Every effort aimed at reform was viewed with suspicion and every attempt at improvement was blocked. Their ignorance became so dense that finally in 1900 they set loose the bloodthirsty Boxers of that year. What followed that nefarious rascality is too sad a story to repeat. Suffice it to say that hundreds and hundreds of men, women, and children were ruthlessly put to the sword and billions of dollars in property were consigned to the torch. China herself barely escaped the curse of being dismembered; and that only after the payment of an indemnity of $300,000,000, besides the sacrifice of Formosa and Korea, a territory as large as Germany and more productive than all Spain. It is only Providence itself that has saved China to play her part. Patriots continued their efforts to plead with the dynasty for substantial reforms in order to save the country and the dynasty itself; but their efforts were of no avail. Foreign Powers pounded at its door, sometimes with advice and sometimes with threats, but to no purpose. Thus, dominated by a characteristic ignorance and selfishness, the ultra-conservative Manchu Court closed the doors of the country, stuffed up its ears to the cry of the people, blindfolded its own eyes before the pitiable plight of the nation, and plunged itself and the country deeper and deeper into a state of benighted darkness.

Being face to face with such conditions of the country and having lost all hope of any possibility of inducing the Manchu Court to reform, the Chinese people finally recognized that nothing short of a revolution could remove the primary causes. Therefore, instead of wasting any more time to coax the Manchu Court, they set about to plan for its removal.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These are some of the primary factors which culminated in the great revolution. As destruction, undesirable as it is, was found necessary to precede construction, people therefore attempted a series of assassinations and revolts which came as forerunners of the revolution itself. The first sign of this destructive programme broke out in 1905, with the explosion of a bomb in Peking aimed at the five commissioners who were sent to travel in Europe and America to inquire into the constitutional forms of government. Then came numerous other attempts at revolt in different parts of the country. Such attempts became more numerous as well as more formidable each time, resulting, however, in the execution of many revolutionists in payment of the penalty for their rash patriotism. But the losing of one's head under the executioner's sword for a worthy cause seemed to have marked attraction. The more the revolutionists were executed, the more revolutionists there seemed to be, until they were found everywhere. In the workshops, in the newspaper offices, in the universities and colleges, among the soldiers, and even in the Forbidden City itself people were suspected of being revolutionists. Indeed, the time was ripe and a general upheaval seemed inevitable.

Definite plans were made in Wu Chang for a sustained trial at revolution on a large scale in December, 1911, which was to begin simultaneously in many parts of the country so as to dumfound the Manchus by the first shock. Things looked more favorable as time went on. But suddenly a bomb, which was being prepared for the revolution, accidentally exploded on October 9th, which prematurely gave alarm to the Manchus. The place of the explosion was immediately raided and the whole plan of the revolution, together with a roll of the revolutionists' names, were seized. Wholesale arrests were made and executions went on right and left. The situation was desperate. There was no time to lose. So the revolutionists were forced to make an immature attempt on October 10th. In the darkness of night these revolutionists, with white badges around their arms and seizing every weapon they could get hold of, swept over the whole city like wildfire. The military forces were so full of revolutionary elements, and the preparation was so quickly made, that except a handful of bodyguards, who fled with their imperial commander, every officer and man turned revolutionary. Disorderly firing and marshaling of troops

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

went on all night. No one felt his life secure or knew what was actually taking place. It was a night of desperate struggle; it was a night of anxiety. But when morning dawned in the east the revolutionists found the whole triad city of Hankow, Wu Chang, and Han-Yang, with the best arsenal of the country, immense quantity of arms and ammunition, together with several million taels in cash, in their hands. With these sinews of war at their command, they made every minute count. As the details of how all this took place and how General Li Yuan-Hung was elected commander-in-chief of the revolutionary forces, and so forth, are still fresh in our minds, suffice it to say that with hearts full of zeal and determination, hardly knowing where they would find their heads the next moment, General Li and his assistants —mostly returned students from Japan, Europe, or America—immediately commenced a constructive policy which soon anchored the cause of the revolution securely in the sympathy of the Chinese people as well as that of the world.

Thus the revolution, with all its uncertainties, was begun in the very heart of the Empire to decide the most enormous stake known in history—namely, the freedom of 400,000,000 people. The Chinese, hitherto silent and submissive under the imperial yoke, suddenly found their voice and set about with determination to tell the world what they meant to do. Things were begun in earnest. All people—adults, youthful boys, and old men—rushed to the revolutionary camps with equal enthusiasm. Every available space was turned into a drill-ground and every needle was applied to the sewing of uniforms. Within a few days the revolutionary army reached a proportion beyond all expectation.

When this state of affairs was telegraphed to Peking the Imperialists were terror-stricken. Order after order was promulgated, sending all the loyal troops to Wu Chang. Edict after edict was issued, conferring all sorts of titles upon every human being from whom they thought they could get any military support. So, in spite of the sympathy and threatened revolt of many soldiers, a large army of modern drilled troops was soon marshaled in front of Hankow. The Imperialists had hoped that the appearance of such a formidable army, with all its Maxims, mountain-guns, and other deadly-looking weapons of modern warfare, could easily scare the life out of the raw and untrained revolutionists. So they marched forward as the Redcoats

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

did in 1776 in front of Bunker Hill, expecting to meet no serious resistance. In this, however, they were mistaken. Indeed, they were confounded when the bullets of the despised rebels riddled through their bright uniforms. They found they had to fight. Thus both sides settled down to real business and the civil war began in earnest.

As the thrilling details of how battle after battle was fought around Hankow, how hand-to-hand clashes were made both day and night, how fortresses were taken and retaken, and how step by step the sheer superiority of the imperial troops pressed on and finally recaptured Hankow—as all these details must be still fresh in our memory, we need not repeat them again. Suffice it to say that the Imperialists had to pay heavily for what they gained. The revolutionary army, untrained as it was, was of the " dare-to-die " sort. They would not give up an inch until they were either killed to the last man or disabled from pulling the trigger.

But from the very start of the real conflict, it was obvious that the ill-equipped revolutionists were at a great disadvantage in front of the modern Imperial troops. The revolutionists were mostly raw recruits who had never been under gun-fire. In fact, many of them were old farmers and young school-boys who had never seen a firearm before and who scarcely knew the dangerous end of a rifle. Back sights need not have been invented so far as they were concerned. Nor were gun-butts necessary, for they fired in all sorts of ways—from the level, from the hip, from the stomach, and from everywhere else but the right place. But, in spite of their lack of drill and equipment, they fought bravely because they fought for a worthy cause. They had no regard for hails of bullets, nor did they falter under bursting shells. Their pluck and indomitable perseverance, as a correspondent said, were both marvelous and pathetic. Hundreds and hundreds of these men went forth determined to die. Enlisted on Tuesday, drilled on Wednesday, shot on Thursday was often the fate of many of these revolutionists. Another writer said: " The Chinese revolution gave to the world an object-lesson of the power of love of country and passion for freedom to make the downtrodden coolie a brave and enthusiastic fighting-machine." For those who went forth knew in their hearts that they were not alone on the field, but that there were thousands and even millions of their compatriots who were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ready to die with them if it need be. Indeed, such united sentiment among such a large number of people has never been known before. The Northerner and the Southerner, the men from the East as well as the men from the West, all rushed to the revolutionary ranks, eager to fight, shoulder to shoulder, and ready to fall side by side. Thus this industrious and peaceful people silently but unmistakably made it known that they meant to redeem their freedom.

But the superiority in marksmanship and equipment of the Imperial troops told heavily on the revolutionary army. Whole regiments, even whole battalions, of these revolutionists were sometimes mowed down like wheat before the scythe. Step by step, inch by inch, the Imperial army pressed onward toward Hankow, until finally they stormed it in a pitch-dark night under cover of a pouring rain.

This capture of Hankow by the Imperialists placed the revolutionary cause in a very doubtful plight so far as Wu Chang was concerned. With their modern guns mounted on the surrounding hills, it looked as if they would in a few hours wipe out all the revolutionary forces from this place where the revolution started. Indeed, the Manchu Court had hoped that this serious reverse would have knocked the spirit out of the revolutionists to such an extent that they would become disorganized, that their leaders would in true old-fashioned style begin to quarrel among themselves, and that they would all come to their senses. Overtures of surrender were actually offered to General Li. But in this belief they were again mistaken. The loss of Hankow, serious as it was, failed to make any deep impression upon the revolutionists in face of their determination. They stuck together closer than ever and preferred to fight under the fire of the Imperial cannon rather than to think of giving up.

Moreover, it must be recalled that the revolution was not limited to Hankow alone. The excellent example and marvelous pluck of these men at Wu Chang had such an effect that, while the Imperialists were pressing on Hankow, revolutions broke out spontaneously in many other important centers of the whole Empire. One after another large cities and even whole provinces turned revolutionary. By the time the Imperial army reached Hankow every province south of the Yangtse River declared independence. The whole Empire was vehemently fomented and the Imperial power was fast disintegrating everywhere. What

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made the Ruling House more hopeless was the conversion of the whole fleet to the revolutionary cause. The movement became so wide-spread and the sentiment of the people so united that no Imperialist knew for sure who were revolutionists and who were not. Hence the capture and burning of Hankow by the Imperial troops, instead of disheartening the revolutionists, only made them more determined than ever before to push the struggle to its ultimate end. Within a few days of the fall of Hankow the revolutionary army captured Nanking, the last Imperial city south of the Yangtse River.

Thus, early in January, just about three months after the outbreak of the revolution at Hankow, seventeen of the twenty-three provinces became revolutionary, while an Imperial army of over 70,000 men stood facing a revolutionary force of about three times that number. The terrific loss in dead and wounded within this short period already amounted to something like 30,000 to 50,000, and the enormous damage to property was beyond estimation. The Imperialists were determined to make the last struggle to maintain their dignity, while the revolutionists were equally determined to fight to the bitter end to win their freedom. Thus, as one went around in the different places, to hear the bugle of mobilization, to see the drilling of new men, to observe the silent determination written on their faces, and to come into contact with those who were ready to lay down their lives for the betterment of their country, one felt, with a shivering thrill through his system, that a prolonged and desperate clash between iron and blood was sure to continue.

But as if the Almighty had purposely intended to make the great revolution a new miracle in history, it was just at this moment when everything looked dark and hopeless that the revolution took another unexpected turn. After having fought over two months and seen such terrific loss both in life and property, our people began to question the advisability of continuing blindly in the beaten path of our barbarous ancestors in trying to settle the controversy of civil war simply by the heartless shedding of human blood. They felt more and more the folly of Chinese fighting Chinese for the vain glory of the degenerate Manchu Court. Every man killed or wounded, be he revolutionist or Imperialist, and every dollar spent, no matter by which side, meant just that much loss to the country. Therefore, it was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realized that the sooner fighting was brought to an end the better it would be for the country. A loud cry was spontaneously raised by the thinking people, both Chinese and foreign friends of China, in favor of a peaceful solution of the controversy. It was argued everywhere that instead of settling the question at issue by brutal force, why not settle it by reason and right.

About the same time the Imperialists also began to feel that some other means than mere fighting were imperative in order to avoid a complete annihilation. In two months' time of continued struggle they found that, no matter how many battles they might win or how many rebels they might bayonet to death, the revolution itself continued to grow and spread. They were convinced that they could kill the rebel, but not conquer him. Then, again, the Imperial treasury, the sinew of war, was rapidly becoming as empty as a balloon. Only the poorer class of the Imperialists, who had not much to contribute, were the people who cried out for war. But the rich princes and wealthy dukes were not willing to pay, and the Imperial Court could not squeeze a cent out of them. This lack of money and the terror wrought by the indomitable zeal of the revolutionists gradually forced the Imperialists to see that unless they found some means of getting out of it their cause was doomed.

Thus both sides were ready for peace. An armistice was declared. A peace conference was immediately arranged. Without any loss of time Mr. Tang Shao-yi, a graduate of Columbia University, with four other Imperial representatives, met the revolutionary Peace Commissioners, headed by Dr. Wu Ting-Fang, in Shanghai. These peace plenipotentiaries sat down face to face to discuss the terms of settlement. This group of young men, mostly educated in Japan, England, and the United States, held in their hands the existence or extinction of the Dragon Throne which had ruled supreme for centuries in China. What was of even greater weight, however, was the fact that upon the shoulders of these men hung the question whether war, with all its bitterness, was to continue or whether reason, with its blessings of prosperity, should rule. Not only the Chinese people, but the whole world, turned their eyes toward this epoch-making peace conference. For its effects, then about to shape the future of China, not only involved a quarter of the human race, but affected all civilized nations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The main question at issue was whether imperialism or democracy should rule in China. Simple as this question may appear, it was conceived by the world then that it involved such far-reaching and unknown complications that it was a question to be settled only by force, as had always been the case heretofore. Many foreigners thought it was all humbug, to use the proper word, to try to settle the question of dynasty by peaceful measures. Many Chinese also felt that the peace talk was only to gain time for renewed and more desperate fighting. The Peace Commissioners themselves found innumerable blocking-stones in their way and at once realized that they had an unenviable task to perform. Peace seemed impossible; and yet peace was imperative. Every heart turned toward Shanghai. For days there was little encouragement. The renewed armistice was about to end. No conclusion or agreement seemed in sight. To make things worse, the revolutionary troops were disgusted with the prolonged talk of peace and they openly objected to further time being wasted in the negotiations. The resumption of hostilities looked imminent.

But the unexpected again happened. The Peace Commissioners, by sheer reasoning, forced all parties to see that the question which was of even greater importance than the existence or extinction of the Manchu dynasty was the preservation of the country. This conviction, together with the confidence of the people, which was roused by the painstaking labor and magnanimous attitude of these Peace Commissioners, gradually chased away the threatening war clouds and the Prince of Peace came out triumphant. As the details regarding the adoption of the republican form of government, the unparalleled liberal treatment of the dethroned dynasty, as well as the details of other unique characteristics of the conference, were so recently reported in the daily papers, we need not repeat them, except to add that without the firing of another shot or the shedding of another drop of blood the oldest dynasty in the world was induced to retire with satisfaction; and the Dragon, whose fangs have bitten into our life, whose claws have cramped our capability, and whose general ugliness has reigned supreme for centuries over our people, was once, and once for all, hauled down, and in its place was triumphantly hoisted the five-colored flag which signifies unity and equality among the five sections of the Chinese people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So the Chinese nation, after being bound hand and foot for centuries, has at last courageously broken loose from her past and is now ready to step forward to make use of her unlimited potentiality.

Now, what is going to be the effect of this tremendous change? This is what especially interests us, for it is universally recognized that what affects China affects the whole world. Answers to this question are too many to enumerate. Suffice it to say that for China herself it means a steady advancement in all branches of modern civilization, and to her friends it offers an unprecedented opportunity. With the adoption of a modern republican constitution and the codification of her laws, China, once free from her ancient bondages, will march forward by leaps and bounds. There are the railways to build, the mines to open, the industries to develop, the religious attitude to shape, the social fabric to weave. In short, China has to be remade. As was the case with the revolution itself, the impending changes will be accomplished with such speed that we shall soon find China a brand-new country, a regular workshop with her teeming population. China has contributed to the outer world in the past. Once free from obstacles, China, with her untold resources and wholesome traditions, will soon begin to make stupendous contributions again.

In this transformation China will offer an unprecedented opportunity to men of all professions. The educator will find a new field, the theologian will have a fresh opening, the manufacturer will meet a gigantic consumer, the merchant will discover a golden market. Indeed, one of the most certain things to follow the recent upheaval will be the enormous increase in China's foreign trade. On this point all observers—optimists and pessimists alike—agree. The world will see in China a stride forward in commercial progress such as it has never seen before. China has held back from foreign things for centuries. The foreign imports, which have already reached enormous proportions, represent only what has been hammered into China through closed doors and which hardly represent a tithe of the trade that will accompany the opening up of the country. During her period of seclusion the seed has been sown for such a harvest of trade and commercial prosperity that it will keep all the factories of the world busy to cope with her demands. When we realize the vast dimensions of her terri-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tory, the enormity of her population, and her unlimited resources, we then begin to feel that China's market is stupendous. The recent discarding of the queue may be taken as an instance. With the removal of this useless appendage there immediately arose a demand for the foreign hat. A trade was at once created and into the country poured foreign head-gears of every description—felts, derbies, stovepipes, and even "merry-widows." Thus hats of all sorts were sold by the hundreds of thousands every day; and in the short period of a few months China had practically been rehatted.

But the hat constitutes only a very small part of what a man needs. After the hat the foreign shoe is now gradually attracting attention. And in this trade Americans ought to find it easy to compete with all others. But what is needed by the individual bears no comparison to what is needed by the nation. Materials for our railways, machinery for our mines, tools for our agriculture, ships for our commerce, outfits for our factories—in short, we need everything. In spite of all sorts of drawbacks and behind closed doors, China's trade has doubled during the last decade. What will be the magnitude of the trade during the ten years to come when not only the doors of the country, but also the hearts of the people, are wide open? So vast is the country, so enormous the population, so immense the resources, and so unlimited the needs that it is impossible to form a just estimate of the value of that market. As the nineteenth century was a century of mechanical inventions, so the twentieth century will be a century of trade development. In this respect, at least, the Chinese revolution has been highly opportune. We can see, if we will, in the Far East a dawn of a greater day, and in this transformation China pledges herself to open up the whole country where business men of all nations and every trade may enjoy a fair chance in the supply of the unlimited demands for the regeneration of a quarter of the human race.

But in our regeneration it is not material development alone that is going to receive our attention. Intellectual as well as moral advancement shall also occupy an equal portion of our thought. Our traditions teach us that when we enjoy what is present we shall not only look to the future, but also reflect on the past. China as a republic is but a baby, but as a nation she is the grandmother of all. She

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has seen the rise and fall of Egypt, she has witnessed the splendor and dissolution of the Roman Empire. She has been able to stand the test of these ages and outlive all her contemporaries, not entirely because of material prosperity or because she has armed her people to the teeth so as to war at every one that comes along, but because she has taught her people to be industrious, honest, and peace-loving. These inheritances have preserved us in the past and will form our guiding principle in the future.

This leads us to examine briefly the part which the United States has played in the revolution and also what bearing this tremendous change will have upon the United States. First of all it may be interesting for many to hear that the revolution has been called in some quarters an American revolution. They say this because there is so much Americanism in it. Most of the leaders of the revolution either received their education or got their ideas of republicanism from America. Dr. Sun, the originator of the revolution, got much inspiration from the United States, where he sojourned so many years and where he found not only complete safety, but sympathetic encouragement, while a price was on his head. The Hon. Mr. Tang Shao-yi, our great Peace Commissioner, was one of the one hundred and twenty young men who first came to America some thirty years ago. The Hon. Dr. Wu Ting-Fang, at the age of seventy-eight, who is well known in America, is often called a Yankee. Then we find in the revolutionary Government at Nanking the Hon. Dr. Chin-Tao Chen, Minister of Finance, and the Hon. Dr. Chung-Hui Wang, Minister of Foreign Affairs, who are graduates of Yale. And so down the list are a large number of American-educated students in the revolution. This is not all. In the Assembly it was also the American-returned student who held the rudder. The first chairman of that representative body, for instance, was the Hon. Mr. Chao S. Bok, a graduate of New York University; and the vice-chairman, who was also the ablest speaker of the House, was the Hon. Mr. Chengting Wang, another graduate of Yale. Then there were scores of others from American universities, such as Harvard, Chicago, Wisconsin, Illinois, and California, who played important parts in the revolution. In the provinces as well we also find the American-educated students in every center of activity, with their sleeves rolled up to their elbows, working in true Yankee style.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The handful of young men who received their education from America have already shown the Chinese people and the world as well what they have learned from their colleges. What is more significant is that which may be expected hereafter from the hundreds and hundreds of Chinese young men now found in every important educational institution in the whole United States. For it is in America that we have the largest number of students in any single foreign country outside of Japan; and it is also here that the young Chinese learn the American push and the business spirit. They always remember their universities and colleges with gratitude. These memories have done them good, and in return they have done credit to their Alma Mater.

The good showing made by the American-returned students, together with the square deal and disinterested fairness of the United States shown to China heretofore, have already made a tremendous impression in the minds of the Chinese people. The bold action taken by the late beloved John Hay to maintain China's integrity during our tribulations of 1900, the new standard of international morality set by Colonel Roosevelt in returning the surplus Boxer indemnity, and the good efforts of President Taft in preventing foreign interference during our revolution—these actions of American statesmen have aroused such a feeling of gratitude among the Chinese people that China to-day not only worships these individuals, but extends her good-will to the whole American people.

Then we Chinese are thankful to those Americans who have since the early forties forsaken their own homes and their dear ones to risk the oceans in coming over to our country for the Christian, or Confucian, purpose of establishing schools, starting hospitals, and building churches. We realize that the untiring efforts of these true Christians must have contributed a great share not only in making our revolution a success, but in making it so moderate, so civilized, and so sane.

Therefore, we can safely say that to-day, on the eve of the transformation and opening up of China with her untold wealth, stupendous market, and unlimited future, the United States holds the highest advantage over all other nations. The American merchant is much preferred, the American missionary is better trusted, the American university is more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desired. In short, everything American shares a certain amount of this good-will.

In the recent revolution itself America has always been looked upon as a good friend. To repeat, it is America that has taken the lead in preventing some of the Powers from interfering with our domestic affairs. There is not the least doubt that China will become more friendly to America and learn more from her than from any other country. We have to-day more than eight hundred students in American schools, with more to come over. When these young men return to China as engineers, agriculturists, foresters, and so forth, do you think that they can turn their backs upon the United States and flirt with Germany or Russia? Impossible! They will want everything American to which they are accustomed. Therefore, there is no reason why America should not get the lion's share of the possibilities of our regeneration.

Moreover, this troop of students constitutes the best kind of emissaries of good-will between our two countries. For they do not only study American text-books, but they learn to love America next only to our own republic.

Then, again, the two countries have always been good neighbors, never having had a serious quarrel. When the Panama Canal opens in 1915 our republic will no longer remain a baby, but will become a youth, and there will be no reason why the two greatest republics in the world should not come even closer together and join hands to co-operate with their common friends in guarding the Pacific so that its peace and tranquillity may last forever.

In conclusion, we may observe that this great revolution has shown that when the opportunity comes the Chinese people can unite and achieve what they should in a sane and systematic manner even under great excitement. With their industrious habits, wholesome traditions, and instinctive love of peace, these Chinese millions are to-day ready to begin their programme of economic and moral development along modern lines and will soon turn their unparalleled inheritance into account not only for China's own benefit, but for that of all peace-loving nations. Instead of remaining the Sick Man of the East, China will soon contribute her share in promoting honorable peace among nations as well as in the advancement of the civilization of mankind.

CHING-CHUN WANG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GRAIN-GROWING AND CANADIAN EXPANSION

BY EDWARD PORRITT

CANADA has had full control of her own affairs since the forties of the nineteenth century—certainly since 1858, when the United Provinces of Quebec and Ontario enacted a tariff in which protective duties were levied on imports from Great Britain. The older provinces—Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, and Ontario—have been of Confederation since 1867. Progress in the material development of the Dominion, despite many obstacles, has been almost continuous since that time; but in no period since 1867 has the progress of the Dominion been so obvious to the world as in the six years from 1906 to 1912. All this progress and all the attention that Canada is now attracting are due almost entirely to the immigration of the last six years into the four provinces of the Dominion west of the Great Lakes, and in particular to the extension during that period of the area under grain in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta.

It is, I am convinced, no exaggeration to say that neither the old nor the new world ever before witnessed an immigration comparable with that which since 1906 has been pouring into the provinces west of the Great Lakes. There certainly was never before an immigration into any part of the Anglo-Saxon world that was accompanied by such activity in bringing new lands under cultivation, in the extension of existing railways and the building of new lines, or in the provision of public works by governments and municipalities as has been going on since Saskatchewan and Alberta, formerly of the Northwest Territories, came into the Dominion as provinces in 1905.

Immigration into the United States since 1900 has been much larger than immigration into Canada during the same

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

twelve years. But in this country it is not newly opened lands that are the attraction; and immigration into the United States in recent years has distributed itself among the industrial cities, where a fully developed political civilization was in readiness for the new-comers. Part of the immigration into Canada since 1900 has gone to the cities of Montreal and Toronto and to the smaller industrial centers of Ontario, where a political civilization was fully developed and where the problems created by the new-comers were those of housing and school accommodation. By far the larger part of the immigration, however, has gone into the prairie provinces, and especially into Saskatchewan and Alberta. It has gone into an area that seven years ago had a population of less than two hundred thousand; and here a political civilization much more complete and comprehensive than that of the period when this area was governed as Northwest Territories from Ottawa has had to be organized while the stream that began in 1906 has been pouring in.

Manitoba has been a province since 1870; British Columbia has been of Confederation since 1871; but material progress in these two provinces was slow, hesitating, and uncertain until the great tide of immigration spread over the whole of the country between the Great Lakes and the Rocky Mountains. The main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Port Moody, British Columbia, was completed in 1886. From the time the railway reached as far west as Winnipeg and Brandon—Manitoba cities which were connected with the head of the Lakes and with Ottawa and Montreal in 1883—free grants of homesteads from the Dominion Government, cheap lands from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Hudson Bay Company, grain-growing on these lands and the business enterprises incidental to grain-growing have been the magnet that has attracted immigration to the country between the Great Lakes and the foot-hills of the Rocky Mountains. For fourteen or fifteen years after the Canadian Pacific had opened out this country the movement of population into it was comparatively slow. There were not more than 420,000 people—not more than the population of many an American city of the first class—in what are now Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta at the census of 1901; and in the grain season that preceded this census—the season of 1899-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1900—although the export of grain from Manitoba had been going on since 1883 and from what is now Saskatchewan from 1884, the total quantity of wheat available for Canadian milling and for export was not quite twelve and a half million bushels.

An immigration propaganda has been conducted by the Dominion Government continuously since Manitoba came into Confederation in 1870. Its aim since the Canadian Pacific Railway began to serve Manitoba in 1883 has been to induce immigration from oversea and from the United States into the country west of the Lakes. From Confederation to 1912 the Dominion has spent $17,000,000 on this propaganda. Nearly eight and a half million dollars—half of the aggregate expenditure since Confederation—were spent between the incoming of the Laurier Administration in 1896 and its defeat at the general election in 1911.

Much new energy was infused into the propaganda from 1897 onward; but the full effect of the policy of stimulating immigration from the United States and continental Europe, as well as from England, Scotland, and Ireland, was not apparent until the turn of the century. From 1896 to 1900 in no year did the number of immigrants reach fifty thousand, and by no means all these immigrants went into the prairie provinces. Since 1900 people have been moving into the prairie provinces at an average rate of a little over one hundred thousand a year. The stream, which began to reach to its present proportions only in 1906, began to widen in 1902, when the total number of immigrants arriving in Canada was 67,000. But taking the year 1900 as the starting-point the average annual immigration into Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta and British Columbia has been over one hundred thousand.

Of the 2,118,712 immigrants who arrived in Canada in the years from 1900 to 1912, the destination of 1,202,497 was in the provinces west of the Lakes. A large proportion of the 903,000 immigrants who arrived in the Dominion in these twelve years not booked through to the West migrated there later on; and in these twelve years also tens of thousands of Canadians, born in Ontario or Quebec or the Maritime Provinces, joined the stream of new-comers from oversea or from the United States that has been continuously pouring into the grain-growing provinces and British Columbia.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Until 1908 or 1909 British Columbia received only a trickle of the immigration. The main stream did not go beyond the prairie country of which Calgary, Alberta, is the western center. But since 1909 population has been spreading all over the four western provinces; and British Columbia, while it is not of the grain-growing territory, has been enormously stimulated in its development by the constantly increasing area of land in the prairie provinces that since 1906 has been put under grain. Oats, barley, and flax are now grown in these provinces. Over fifty-three million bushels of oats were graded by the Government inspectors at Winnipeg in the season of 1911–12—the season which began on September 1, 1911, and ended on the 31st of August last. Flax is exported to oil-mills in the United States, while for oats, in addition to the export trade by way of Montreal or Buffalo, there has been during the last four or five years a growing demand from the hundreds of railway construction camps dotted all over the country from the Lakes to the Pacific Ocean. But it is wheat that gives Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta their world-wide fame. It is wheat-growing that since 1900 has been attracting to these provinces men who intend to make their living from the land; and on the success and expansion of wheat-growing depend the industrial and commercial prosperity of the older provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

With the exception of Prince Edward Island—the little garden province, with less than a hundred thousand inhabitants, with no mineral or lumber resources, and practically no manufactures — all the provinces are more or less affected by the prosperity of the great and constantly extending wheat-growing area of the Dominion. British Columbia, which lies adjacent to this area, is confidently expecting gains in trade and population from the opening of the Panama Canal. If the canal were already open and the expected increases in the lumber and coal industries and in the transport and distributing business of British Columbia were in hand, with further increase well in sight, prices for sites in Vancouver and Victoria for department stores, hotels, office buildings, and warehouses could scarcely be higher than they have been during the last three years. An enormous amount of railway building is now going on in British Columbia. The Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern, and the Great Northern are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all spending large sums of money in the province. The Canadian Pacific expenditures are on extensions at Vancouver and in its neighborhood. Those of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern are on lines connecting British Columbia with the prairie provinces and the East. But these extensions and new lines are due not so much to the construction of the Panama Canal as to the development of the last ten years in the three grain-growing provinces.

It is, moreover, this great development in the country between the Rocky Mountains and the Great Lakes that accounts for the growth of the coal and lumber industries of British Columbia and for the large increase in recent years in fruit culture along the shores of Okanagan, Arrow, Kootenay, and other of the beautiful lakes of British Columbia. Most of the fruit grown in these valleys is marketed in the prairie provinces, where little or no fruit of any kind is grown.

The newer fame of Victoria and Vancouver as residential cities is also partly due to the prosperity of the grain-growing provinces. British Columbia was famous for its scenery and its climate in the days when it was a crown colony. These attracted settlers from England in the fifties and sixties of last century. They have attracted tourists from eastern Canada and the United States ever since the Canadian Pacific was carried across the continent in 1886, since the days when there were not a hundred thousand people in the wide stretch of country between Port Arthur and the Pacific coast. The vogue of British Columbia as a tourist resort has increased with the growth of population in the middle western and the inter-mountain States; but much of the prosperity of British Columbia which is due to its climate and its scenery, as distinct from recent developments in lumbering, mining, and fisheries, may be attributed to the prosperity of grain-growers in the prairie provinces and of business men in the cities who are engaged in enterprises that are subsidiary or incidental to the great business of grain-growing.

In the prairie provinces men look eastward when intent on business. Their interests then lie in the direction of Toronto or Montreal. On holiday bent, or when intent on escaping the rigors of winter in the prairie provinces, they turn westward; and this tendency of people in these prov-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inces during the last six or seven years has made Victoria and Vancouver popular residential cities, cities which bid fair to become the Brighton, the Hastings, or the Eastbourne of the Dominion.

It is this prosperity of the grain-growing provinces also that keeps the iron and steel plants and the woolen-mills of far-distant Nova Scotia employed. Halifax and Sydney, the principal ports of Nova Scotia, both profit from it. From Sydney during navigation season rails and other products of the local steel-mills are shipped to Port Arthur and Fort William for distribution in the prairie provinces; and Halifax in the winter months, when the St. Lawrence is closed by ice, gets a large share of the immigration business and of the import trade of the West. The cotton-mills in the neighborhood of St. John, and the shoe factories at Fredericton, New Brunswick, prosper when the prairie provinces are prospering; and from December to April St. John is the only Canadian port from which grain is shipped to Great Britain.

Every province, except Prince Edward Island, has thus a direct interest in the inflow of immigration and in the extensions that follow in the area under grain in the prairie provinces. But none of the provinces east of the Lakes have a greater interest in the West than Ontario and Quebec; for grain-growing beyond the Lakes is for the Dominion, and for these two provinces in particular, much what the gold-mines on the Rand and the diamond-mines at Kimberley are for all the four States of the South African Union. If it were possible to imagine the mines eliminated from the industrial economy of British South Africa it would be difficult to see what reason Johannesburg and Kimberley would have for existence; and without Johannesburg and Kimberley, Cape Town, Port Elizabeth, East London, and Durban would be deprived of four-fifths of the importing, distributing, and banking business of which they are now the centers.

Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, and Hamilton are not so dependent on grain-growing in the prairie provinces as Cape Town and Durban are on the mines. These Canadian cities were ports and centers of distribution, and of some manufacturing, before Confederation, when British Columbia was the only province west of Ontario and when the vast stretch of country between the Lakes and the Rocky Mountains

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was in the sole possession of the Hudson Bay Company. Ontario and Quebec were thriving provinces before Confederation and before East and West were connected by the Canadian Pacific Railway. But the recent growth of Montreal, Toronto, and Hamilton is due to grain-growing beyond the Lakes much more than to any development in rural Ontario or Quebec or any increase in the material progress of the Maritime Provinces. Nearly nine-tenths of the factories of the Dominion are in Ontario and Quebec; and these factories, all protected by the tariff against British as well as American competition, furnish the West with most of its manufactured goods. These two provinces, moreover, benefit enormously from the great increase in transport business—transport by lake and canal as well as by rail—that has come since 1900 with the development of grain-growing in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta.

The newer Ontario cities of Port Arthur and Fort William at the head of lake and canal navigation are even more dependent on grain-growing than Cape Town and Durban are on the gold and diamond mines. These two new cities on Thunder Bay have been created by the grain industry. They are at the gateway to the West. They live and thrive on the movement of grain from west to east and on the movement of merchandise and coal from east to west. Everything going west, whether by lake and canal or by all rail route, must go by way of Port Arthur or Fort William. All the wheat that is not milled at Calgary, Regina, Brandon, or Winnipeg goes eastward for milling in Ontario and Quebec or for export *via* the two cities at the head of the Lakes. There are ten great elevators there; and in the autumn of 1912 three new ones were building, one of which is to be owned and worked by the Dominion Government. In the winter when navigation is closed grain is carried eastward over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Port Arthur and Fort William to St. John for export to Great Britain; and in still larger quantities is stored in the elevators at the head of the Lakes awaiting the opening of navigation in April.

Wheat harvested in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta is graded at Winnipeg by government inspectors before it is shipped eastward. The grain-export business began in 1883 just as soon as the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway made it possible to get Manitoba grain to the head

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Lakes. The Manitoba Grain Act, under which grain is inspected and graded by officers of the Dominion Government, became operative in 1886. But the grain export business was of sixteen years' standing before the wheat graded at Winnipeg in any one year exceeded a total of twenty million bushels. It suddenly increased from eight million bushels in 1898 to twenty-six million bushels in 1899. This was a year before the present stream of immigration began to pour into the prairie provinces—immigration the results of which are strikingly manifest in the grain statistics since 1901. Forty-five and a half million bushels of wheat were sent forward to the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur in 1901. In 1909 ninety-five million bushels went through the elevators, while in the grain year that ended on August 31, 1912, the wheat handled at the upper lake elevators amounted to one hundred and forty-six million bushels. In the current year—that which began on September 1, 1912—the expectation is that two hundred million bushels of wheat will be graded by the government inspectors at Calgary and Winnipeg.

The great increase in the production of grain, directly due to the immigration, is at the foundation of the present wide-spread prosperity in all the provinces of the Dominion, and it accounts for an activity in railway-building in the country west of the Great Lakes that is without precedent in the history of any of the British oversea dominions. This activity in the summer and autumn of 1912 will be better realized when it is recalled that in 1900 the only railway connecting eastern Canada, the Great Lakes, and the Pacific Ocean was the Canadian Pacific. Until the large immigration began in 1900 this road, with its single track and branch lines forking out north and south, met all the needs of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba as regards connection with the ports at the head of the Lakes, with Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, and the Atlantic coast. This was the position in 1900; and it was 1904 before there was any movement for the construction of a second transcontinental railway.

There was legislation in 1904 and 1905 by the Dominion Parliament providing for the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific, which when completed in 1913 will connect all four western provinces with Fort William and Port Arthur and also with Montreal and with tide-water at St. John. Three

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years before the Laurier Government carried the first Grand Trunk Pacific Act through Parliament the Canadian Northern Company had been organized and had taken over from the Government of Manitoba the lines—some three hundred and fifty miles—which had been built by the Northern Pacific and the Manitoba Railway Company and subsequently acquired by the Government. This was the beginning of the Canadian Northern Company, a beginning unlike that of the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk Pacific, which both originated with the Government at Ottawa. Between 1902 and 1908 the Canadian Northern built or acquired other lines outside the province of Manitoba; and it is now constructing lines, chiefly in British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec, which when linked up will give the Dominion its third transcontinental railway.

The western terminal of the Grand Trunk Pacific is already established at Prince Rupert, British Columbia. The western terminals of the Canadian Northern are to be at Vancouver and Port Mann on the Fraser River. While an enormous area of new land is opened out by these new lines of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern, these lines, like those of the older Canadian Pacific, are to serve all the larger cities between the Great Lakes and the Pacific coast. Next year will see the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific, which has under construction in the West 1,017 miles of railway, of which 600 are to be finished this year. A year later the Canadian Northern will be completed from the Great Lakes to the Pacific coast and also to Montreal.

Two years before a commencement was made on the Grand Trunk Pacific, and long before it was generally realized that the Canadian Northern was to construct a third transcontinental line, the Canadian Pacific had begun the double tracking of its line from Port Arthur westward toward Winnipeg. Last year the double tracking was carried as far as Brandon, 133 miles west of Winnipeg; and this year it has been continued farther west to Regina and eastward from Vancouver to Kamloops. About 115 miles of the work on these sections was completed in 1912. Double tracking has also been proceeding in 1912 from Port Arthur to Sudbury; and soon after the two new transcontinental lines connect the Atlantic with the Pacific the Canadian Pacific will have a double track railway all the way from Montreal to Vancouver.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pressure during the grain season is greatest between Winnipeg and Fort William, and next between Calgary and Winnipeg. Hence double tracking has been pushed with most energy between the Great Lakes and Calgary. The building of branch lines into new grain-growing areas has proceeded with the work of double tracking; and in 1912 over eight hundred miles of steel have been laid on new branch lines of the Canadian Pacific between the Great Lakes and the Pacific Ocean.

Since 1906 new stations have been built at every city on the Canadian Pacific between Port Arthur and Banff, Alberta. The spaciousness and beauty of these stations are a surprise to visitors who are in the West for the first time. But these new stations, like the new legislative buildings at Regina, Edmonton, and Victoria, and the buildings of the new provincial universities of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon and of Alberta at Strathcona, are proofs of the confidence of the people of these western provinces that the existing prosperity is on a stable foundation and will continue and increase, no matter what may happen to the extraordinary boom in real estate that since 1910 has extended across the continent from Port Arthur to Victoria.

Nearly twenty thousand men were at work on railway construction in the western provinces during the whole of the season of 1912. The three great railway companies were competing for men; and work on each of the transcontinental lines was limited only by the ability of the contractors to secure men and to obtain rails, structural steel, and other necessary materials. The pressure on the existing lines all through the year, and especially after the grain transport season opened in September, was greater than ever before in the history of the prairie provinces; and the conviction in the West was that just as soon as the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern were connected from coast to coast these companies would be compelled to follow the example of the Canadian Pacific and commence at once to double track their lines from the foot-hills of the Rocky Mountains to the Great Lakes.

EDWARD PORRITT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DELICATE QUESTION OF RAILWAY CREDIT

BY FRANKLIN ESCHER

In no clearer way can the present state of railway credit be set forth than by the bare statement that the railways have practically stopped offering new issues of bonds to the investment-buying public. With traffic moving in the greatest volume ever known and railway facilities very much curtailed as a result of two years of enforced economy, there is every reason why the railroads should be in the market for funds. But such is not the case. Like the man who knows that his credit isn't good and so very wisely keeps away from the bank, railway finance managers are very wisely forbearing to ask investors to subscribe to new issues of railway securities. When those roads whose need for capital is so urgent that they cannot wait are seen paying eight and ten per cent. for the money they cannot do without, most borrowers prefer to keep out of the market altogether.

For the present unwillingness on the part of investors to buy railway bonds—or, putting it another way, to lend money to the railroads—uncertainty as to the effect on earnings of the attitude assumed by the Interstate Commerce Commission during the past couple of years has been directly responsible. During the quarter-century of its existence the Commission has at all times exerted more or less of an influence on railway affairs, but it is only since the summer of 1910, when by Act of Congress its authority was greatly increased, that the Commission's regulatory power has been really strongly exercised. Early in that year, following the threat of a general strike, the railroads granted extensive wage increases to their employees, appealing to the Commerce Commission at the same time for permission to raise their freight-rates correspondingly. That general appeal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was flatly denied, as has been practically every other individual one since made. To the railway mens' repeated statements that a point has been reached where, unless the transportation industry is seriously to suffer, freight-rates have got to be raised, the Commerce Commissioners by word and action have steadily made reply that rates are high enough as they are. On the whole plea of the railroads, indeed, that the increase in their operating expenses brought about by the higher cost of materials and labor entitles them to charge more for the transportation they have to sell, the attitude of the Commission has been absolutely uncompromising.

With one big railroad man after another coming out openly with statements that unless there is a change in the Commerce Commission's attitude a number of important properties will before long find themselves threatened with insolvency, it is hardly to be wondered at that investors are chary about putting their money into railroad securities. It is realized, of course, that the railway men who have been making these very strong statements are, so to speak, interested parties. But, on the other hand, there seems to prevail a strong conviction that unless the railways' need for more revenue were really urgent, these leading figures in the transportation world would hesitate about making statements so certain to bring about further impairment in the investment standing of their own securities. For them to urge the need of higher freight-rates is all very well; it is they themselves who have everything to gain. But unless there were justice in their claims—unless, indeed, the prosperity of the industry does depend upon a change in the treatment accorded the railways, would these authorities go on telling the public the very things best calculated to make it draw its purse-strings even closer, and most certain to make the path of the railroad seeking new capital even thornier than it is now? By the very frankness with which such men as President Ripley, of the Atchison, President Brown, of the New York Central, and President Finley, of the Southern, have been stating their case, they have convinced a good many thinking people that this is no mere attempt on the part of the transportation interests to get more money out of the shippers, but an honest attempt to preserve the integrity of the industry in which they are engaged.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The proportion of the public, however, which has been reached by the fair and frank statements of Messrs. Ripley, Brown, Finley, and the others is almost inconsiderable in comparison with the very large number of persons who believe that the railroads are making plenty of money and that their rates, if anything, should be reduced and not advanced. There has been some subsidence, it is true, in the wave of anti-railroad sentiment which swept the country a couple of years ago and made itself felt in the passing by State legislatures of hundreds of ill-considered anti-railroad laws and regulations. But, although the number of such laws actually put on the statute-books has shown a great falling off during the past year, there is still running strong a current of anti-railroad feeling which is heard in frequent propositions that a physical valuation of the railways be made the basis of a new structure of freight-rates, that railway profits be limited by law, and that Government sanction be required for new issues of securities. Here and there outside of transportation circles a man can be found who believes that the railways are not being treated justly, but in the opinion of the vast majority of people they are getting no more than they deserve. Talk to the average man about the plight the railroads are in, and he will tell you that they are not in any plight, but making lots of money and well able to take care of themselves. The rates they charge for carrying freight, he will probably inform you, are high enough; it would be a good thing, indeed, from *his* point of view, if the Government were to step in and fix things so that the railroads could earn a fair return on the actual amount of money invested, and no more.

Just here we come to the root of the whole trouble—the rapid spread of the idea that the railway is nothing but a public servant, after all, and that as such it ought not to be allowed to earn anything more than a moderate return on the actual amount of its investment. Let us find out how much *is* actually invested in the railways, goes the demagogic cry, and then let us make the railways fix their freight-rates accordingly. To you, shippers of freight, it will mean a much lower charge for sending your product to market. To you, the general consumer, it will mean a corresponding reduction in prices.

Great is the popularity achieved by the idea. Everywhere people have been speaking of the advisability of a physical

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

valuation of railways and "the lowering of the cost of living" which would result from a readjustment of freight-rate schedules. That is perfectly plain and can be understood by anybody. It is much plainer and easier to understand, for instance, than further considerations having to do with reactive effects such a course of action may be expected to exert upon general business. By those advocating the thing that side of it has been carefully kept in the background—along with the question of any rights the railways or the holders of railway securities may have in the matter. Prices to the consumer are to be lowered. Is not that enough?

By the leaders of thought in the railway world the prevalence of this idea is fully appreciated, and it is realized just as fully that as long as it remains uncorrected in the public mind the uncompromising attitude of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which represents the public, is bound to remain unchanged. Only by getting the facts before the public, so that it may see how utterly unlikely such interference with freight-rates is to bring about lower prices, can public sentiment toward the railways be dissuaded from its pursuit of this *ignis fatuus* and brought back to solid ground.

Before anything in that line can be accomplished two great misconceptions must be corrected. The first is that freight-rates have anything to do with capitalization—that is to say, that what a railroad charges for carrying freight should in any way be influenced by the value of the railroad's property. The second is that anything can be gained for the shipper or the general public by limiting railway profits—that is to say, by passing laws that a railroad shall be allowed to earn only so-and-so much on the amount of money invested in the property.

It is the first of these two misconceptions which is probably the more wide-spread. Between capitalization and freight rates, in the average man's mind, there is a close connection. Time and again he has been told that most railways have a lot of watered stock outstanding on which dividends have got to be earned, and that in order to earn these dividends freight-rates have got to be higher than they would be if there were no watered stock to be taken care of. And that, of course, as anybody can see, is all wrong. Just because some railroad has issued a lot of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shares without anything tangible having been paid into the treasury in return, why should shippers along the line and the public in general be made to pay such freight-rates as to allow anything to be earned on this " water "? That as an argument sounds first class. It has, furthermore, been repeated so often that a very large number of people have come, almost unconsciously, to believe that it is true and to associate railway capitalization and railway freight-rates in their minds. A surprising proportion even of thinking people, indeed, believe that when the railways fix their freight-rates the chief consideration they have in mind is to get them high enough so that earnings can be shown on inflated capitalization.

Capitalization is not, never was, and never will be the basis of freight-rates, for the very simple reason that competing lines' capitalization almost invariably differs widely. Take the several roads which compete for business between New York and Chicago. Among them we find about the most conservatively capitalized railroad in the country, running almost side by side with the road that first comes into most people's minds when the subject of over-capitalization is brought up. This latter line we will say, for the purpose of the argument (or, rather, to show its absurdity), decides to fix its freight-rates on such a basis as will allow it to earn dividends on its ocean of common stock. What would be the inevitable result? Simply, of course, that the road wouldn't get any business, and that if it wanted to keep on earning anything at all it would quickly enough have to drop back its charges to a competitive basis—to what, from the shipper's standpoint, *its service is worth.*

What the service is worth—there we have the basis on which freight-rates are really fixed. Not what the railroad would *like* to get or what the capitalization makes it necessary to get in order to pay dividends, but simply what is the money equivalent of the service rendered. Selling railroad transportation is really no different from selling anything else. Imagine a merchant, about to fix a price on a lot of goods, saying to himself: " Here, I and my associates have capitalized this business at more than it is worth and now we have got to make enough money to keep up our dividend. I'll just put such a price on these goods as will allow us to make the amount of money we need." Would that be likely to accomplish the desired result? Hardly.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What does the consumer care about the amount of money the merchant considers it necessary to make? The goods, presumably, have a certain value and that value, or something approximating it, is all the purchaser is willing to pay. Let the merchant arbitrarily mark up the price and one of two things will surely happen—the purchaser will either go somewhere else or will refuse to buy entirely.

Just exactly that same thing is true of railway transportation. Where the question of competition comes in it is obviously impossible for a railroad, in fixing its rates, to pay any attention to what its existing capitalization may be. Nor, in the case where that railroad has a monopoly, is it going to be so foolish as to fix a rate which will impose any check upon the free movement of business. What the railroad wants to see is a constantly developing and enlarging volume of traffic and that result, it very well knows, can be accomplished only by the fixing of freight-rates which are a fair measure of the service rendered. The whole history of American railroading, indeed, is filled with instances of railroads built through territory in the development stage keeping their freight-rates *below* the value of the service rendered in order to give new industries located along the line a chance to get a foothold and grow strong. There is nothing altruistic about it. It is a matter of business pure and simple. The prosperity of the railroad depends upon the prosperity of the territory it serves, and for the railway to forego immediate returns in order to build up future business is a most reasonable sort of policy. The industries located along its lines having developed and become firmly established *as a result of low freight-rates,* the traffic can bear more and rates can be advanced to a point where the railway can make a reasonable profit out of handling the business.

Were the public cognizant of the fact that it is of such threads that the fabric of freight-rates is woven, the demand for a readjustment based upon a physical valuation of railway properties would die out overnight. The whole rate structure, it is plain, has been built up on the idea of developing traffic to the greatest possible degree—of letting a factory in the Middle West, for example, compete with a factory in New England for the New York market. Rates as we have them are not the result of chance or of any desire on the part of anybody to earn dividends on watered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stock. If there is anything sweetly reasonable about modern business it is just this system of railway freight-rates which has, perhaps, done more to develop the country's manufacturing interests than any other one thing. To attempt now to readjust this delicate mechanism on the idea that property investment should govern rates would be exactly like attempting to readjust the works of a chronometer with a crowbar.

The other thing which has done so much to hurt railway credit and keep investors from putting their money into securities of that sort is the spread of the idea that railway profits should be limited by law. A railway, the argument goes, is a public servant, doing its business by virtue of public favor and under a franchise granted by the people. Why, then, should the people allow the railway—any railway—to make large profits at their expense? A certain amount of capital has been invested, it is true, and on that it is only right that a fair return should be earned. But when profits go beyond what is a fair return, why, so the argument runs, should the public go on paying such rates for service as to make these profits possible? Why should not, then, rates be reduced to a point enabling the railroad to pay a fair dividend—say, six or seven per cent. at the outside—and no more?

Ignoring the right and wrong of such a proceeding—its hopeless injustice to those who have in good faith put their money into railway enterprise—and passing directly to the cold question of expediency, would the limitation of profits accomplish the end in view, the lowering of the actual cost of service? *Why, of course it would,* we hear it said; that's the point of the whole thing—to limit profits by making the railway charge less for its service. But just a moment. It stands to reason, of course, that if a railroad is making what is considered too much money and its rates are ordered reduced, its profits will be cut down. But suppose now that as a result of its profits having been cut down the railroad can't spend as much for improvements as it used to and there is deterioration in the service offered. Then how about the lower rates? Apparently they are lower, but are they really so? Well, the shipper pays less money. Yes, but not for the same thing. The railroad, perhaps, was contemplating buying a number of bigger engines or putting in double track or doing other things calculated to make it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible to move freight faster and better. Very possibly now, with its margin of earnings so reduced, it will not feel like spending the money and the improvement in service will not be made. The shipper may be paying less, but he is getting correspondingly less for his money.

But is it a fact that if railway profits are limited by law deterioration of service is bound to follow? In the great majority of cases it is. A few of the big earners might be able to stand reduction of profits without its necessitating economies and so affecting the quality of their service, but the great majority of the railroads are in no position to stand reduction of any consequence in their net income accounts. A large proportion of railroad stocks pay no dividends at all, and in the case of those that do the margin of earnings above requirements is usually no more than enough to allow of necessary betterments and the adding of a little something to surplus account. The idea that American railroads as a whole earn any very great amount of money is very far from being the case. Take the rank and file of the dividend-payers, and it is undeniable that if anything were done further to limit the amount they are able to earn, expenses would have to be so curtailed as to effect serious impairment of service. And that, of course, would only come back on those "enjoying" the reduced freight-rates.

Then, again, were it ordained that a railroad could earn only so-and-so much, greater profits bringing about an automatic reduction in freight-rates, service would suffer because all incentive toward maximum efficiency would be destroyed. What would a road care? Its business having reached the point productive of the greatest revenue legally allowable, what incentive would there be toward better service and a greater degree of efficiency? Efforts in that direction in the conduct of any enterprise are the result of a desire to increase the volume of business and make more money, but in this case that desire would be lacking, or at least shut off by law. We are making all we are allowed to make, the railroad would say. Why should we go on trying to increase our business and improve our service when the only reward we can possibly expect is to have our freight-rates further reduced?

No, limiting railway profits by simply cutting down freight-rates is by no means as simple a proposition as it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would seem. The freight-rate structure, as we have seen, is no arbitrary creation of the railways, but has been piled up stone by stone over a long series of years, according to the needs and development of the country's business. With rates as they are the railroads as a whole are not earning enough money to enable them to make the improvements and extensions they ought to be making. Attempt to limit profits by reducing rates, and serious indeed will be the consequences.

For the present state of railway credit the prevalence of these two ideas is principally responsible. A large part of the public being firm in its belief that a physical valuation of the railroads ought to be made and the whole structure of freight-rates readjusted accordingly, and, furthermore, that no railroad ought to be allowed to earn more than a fixed amount, it is hardly to be wondered at that the investor refuses to put his money into new railway securities. There has been no general "valuation" of railway properties as yet, nor any legislation limiting the amount a railway can earn, but with the public feeling as it does, the danger of these things must be accounted great. Why, under such circumstances, should any one feel like putting money into new railway enterprise?

What is the remedy? How can confidence in railway securities be restored? In one way and in one way only: by putting before the public the facts in the case and relying upon that to bring about correction of the prevalent misapprehension concerning freight-rates. Let the public once see the true position the railways are in and there will be a speedy end to the talk about "valuation" and legal limitation of profits. Very quickly then will follow the restoration of railway securities to that high degree of investment favor they enjoyed but a very few years ago.

FRANKLIN ESCHER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRUST REGULATION

EXPEDIENCY OF COMMODITY COURT

BY ALBERT FINK

II

PUTTING out of view any question of the constitutional power of Congress to organize a Commodity Court or Commission with authority to prescribe a maximum or reasonable charge beyond which trust or quasi-trust products may not be sold, and assuming *arguendo* that such power in fact exists under the Commerce Clause, the next question which suggests itself is as to the expediency of its exercise.

At the outset it must be admitted that the suggestion is at least novel and would seem an effort to control by legislation matters which, if possible, should be left to the natural laws of supply and demand. So far as can be observed, though as yet no very clear statement of their case has appeared in the public prints, the advocates of a commodity court, modeled in the main after the fashion of the Interstate Commerce Commission and invested with price-regulating powers, seem to be composed of two distinct schools of political thought. First, those who believe they see in the necessities of modern civilization an imperative demand for large combination, who insist that restriction of competition is economically sound, resulting in elimination of useless waste, and who, while believing that there should be no governmental interference at all, nevertheless advocate the proposed tribunal as a compromise measure—"a sop to Cerberus," if you please—in the nature of a guarantee to the public against the dreaded extortion of an unrestrained industrial monopoly. Secondly, those who are opposed to all forms of large combination, insisting that competition remain unrestricted, no matter how cruelly ruinous or wasteful of human energy it may prove, but who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nevertheless favor the proposed legislation from an abiding despair of preventing such combination or otherwise adequately dealing with a situation they have come to regard as intolerable.

Both classes seem to advocate the measure from a sense of helplessness and inability to suggest other or better remedies rather than from any apparently deep-rooted conviction of its wisdom. As one of the curses of the times is believed to be " legislative tinkering " and an aptitude for political nostrums when it is suggested that there be a departure so radical from the well-tried principles of government as understood for many generations, as embodied in the utterances of the best experts upon the subject and as evolved by the gradual development of the science, it would seem the part of wisdom before embarking upon these strange and unexplored seas or entering upon these new and untried bridle-paths to examine somewhat minutely both the evil complained of and the remedy suggested.

The evil complained of for which the proposed remedy is offered as a specific is that the monopolistic trusts, having exterminated all competition, will, unless prevented by government, exploit the public by demanding for their products an unreasonable and extortionate price. The remedy suggested is to create by law a maximum beyond which they may not charge. Obviously if there exist combinations of capital which have in fact eliminated all competition and are able to continue so to do, and if there be no other natural law which will in its operative effect protect the public from exploitation, all will agree that government regulation even as to price is not only expedient, but imperative. If, however, on the other hand, it can be shown that there are not now, nor ever can be created in a government such as this, monopolistic trusts with power to eliminate competition otherwise than by the sale of a superior article at a minimum price, and if it can be shown that such policy, even if possible, would be in direct contravention of the material pecuniary benefit of the monopoly, then in either event all should agree that the proposed legislation is useless, undesirable, and unnecessary for the purposes for which it is suggested.

Monopolies are of two kinds. First, those which exist by government grant whereby an exclusive privilege is given to the few, to the exclusion of others, who are prohibited

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by law from engaging in the same or similar enterprises; and, secondly, those which are based purely on economic conditions and created by the ability to produce and market a given commodity at a price cheaper than the same article can be manufactured and distributed by others. As to the first we have little concern. They never have and probably never will exist in this country, save in such a limited sense as may arise from the operation of the patent and copyright laws to which there is no apparent objection. As to the second the danger so far, at least, as excessive prices or inferior product is concerned, would seem to be remote.

In the first place, there has never existed in this country a combination so powerful as to throw off *all* competition, nor even in the absence of the Sherman Act is such combination possible where all are free to enter upon any field of enterprise or industry at such time and upon such terms and conditions as they see fit. Not even Standard Oil, with its superbly organized system, its espionage over competitors, and its baneful domination of the carriers, was able to control the entire manufacture and distribution of refined oil. The Sugar Trust has, perhaps, more nearly than any other approached an actual monopoly; but even here, with all its false weights, rebates, and corrupt manipulation, it was unable to control more than ninety per cent. of the business of refining and distributing sugar, and it is immaterial, so far as the price of the product is concerned, that the trust controls the vast bulk of the business, for any enhanced, excessive, or unreasonable price is merely a signal to the independents already engaged in the business to increase the capacity of their plants and widen the scope of their operations, while to those not already so engaged it is an invitation to enter the field. Monopoly-controlled banks may refuse loans. The "money trust," if such there be, may protest. The monopoly itself may threaten and bully, but the ultimate fact remains that whenever a profit can be shown, either by reason of some new and secret process, the acquisition of some patent, or the enhanced price of the monopoly-controlled products, capital for competition will be available both here and abroad. No sooner will the new rival have entered the field than monopoly must either buy him out at a profit, which is merely to invite others to repeat the same performance, or else so reduce the price of the commodity as to force its new rival to operate at a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loss; but this means that monopoly must undersell its rival's cost of production in all the markets of the country, and inasmuch as this rival is able to secure long-time contracts for its output the process of elimination proves tedious and more costly in the end than would have been the case had monopoly in the first instance maintained a price sufficiently low to render unattractive any invasion of its field of activity.

It is true that an actual monopoly might be created and competition completely eliminated by acquisition or control of transportation of the raw material, but as to the former the railroads have been very thoroughly divorced from the industrials, and an Interstate Commerce Commission and very drastic laws have rendered discriminatory rates and rebates relics of the past. As to the latter, it is hardly likely that any combination will ever be able to acquire that control of the raw material necessary to the successful operation of monopoly bent on public exploitation through excessive prices. The country is too vast, its resources too boundless; such a plan would mean too much idle capital locked up in natural resources for the sole purpose of preventing their acquisition or use by others. Monopolies must pay the interest on their bonded indebtedness and dividends to their stockholders. So, too, the cost of importation of the raw material from other lands is in many instances less than the cost of its transportation from one part of this country to another. And to acquire that monopoly which would or could appreciably affect the price of the finished product, not only must the raw material of this country be controlled, but that of the world as well. Again, it is to be remembered that no sooner does a trust commodity reach a price unreasonably high than it comes in direct competition with the world at large. It must always be sold in this country at the price at which it is offered in other nations plus freight and tariff. Ocean freights add little to the cost of production, and, inasmuch as one of the great political parties is avowedly for free trade and the other for a tariff only, where such is needed to protect the home industry, any excessive price may be promptly regulated by the simple process of tariff reduction.

But there is yet another natural law of trade which precludes the possibility of excessive or extortionate charge. Just as in the manufacture of automobiles the constant

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effort is to produce a durable and efficient machine at a reduced price, so in every other industry the same tendency may be observed, nor is the ultimate purpose solely to undersell the competitor. It is a fundamental principle underlying the modern conception of sound business methods. A market must be made for the product. This market must be developed, cultivated, and enlarged. Such prices must be offered to consumers as will not only *enable* them, but also *induce* them to buy. Such combinations as aspire to monopoly in any given field require large investments of capital. This outlay must be distributed in mills and plants located at such convenient places throughout the country as have been calculated to be the cheapest and most economical points for manufacture and distribution. Great pay-rolls fall due weekly and monthly. There are terminal and managerial expenses, stupendous fixed charges, interest, dividends. These mills must be kept going else there is so much wasted and idle capital. These employees must be kept engaged lest labor skilled in the specific trade fall into the hands of willing and ever-ready competitors. The fixed charges must be met, the interest paid when due. Dividends must be earned. This requires a market here or abroad. A surplus may occasionally be sold abroad cheaper than at home, but this must be a rare occurrence if a protective tariff is desired. The market at home must be made to absorb the bulk of the product. Obviously the commodity must be offered at a price at which the home market is able to buy, or the market itself is destroyed. The day of small sales and large profits has long since departed. All business science points to large and ready sales with low profits —rapid turning over of the capital invested. A large market with small profits has these advantages over a small market with large profits: in the first case the market itself gradually expands, thus in turn increasing the profits, while in the other case the market gradually shrinks as people cease consumption and educate themselves to the use of substitutes, thus in turn forcing an ever-increasing price in order to maintain an equilibrium of profit. Obviously a diminishing market with a corresponding increase in price invites competition, while an expanding market with a decrease in price has an opposite effect.

In view of these considerations, it would seem that the danger of excessive or unreasonable charges upon trust-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

controlled or partially controlled products is more fanciful than real, that from economic laws more potential in their operation than those of any legislature, there is little reason to fear that in the near future at least there will be either such monopolization of production or distribution of any given commodity or elimination of a balancing and equalizing competition as need cause serious alarm. In order to insure reasonable prices, it is not necessary that there be actual competition. It is sufficient that there *may be—self-interest does the rest.* When the price of cotton reaches an unreasonable figure over the cost of production there is a corresponding increase in the next year's crop. When the price becomes unreasonably low, production is curtailed. As it is with cotton so it is with every other commodity. The natural laws of trade, of supply and demand, more surely maintain a just and desirable equilibrium than would be possible by virtue of any legislative act.

But even if it be conceded that the price of monopolistic products might at times be slightly in excess of what they would be if there were no large combinations, and the manufacture and distribution were more equally divided among numbers of competitive individuals and corporations such as existed prior to the time when improved transportation facilities made available to the producer the markets of the entire country, thus rendering such combinations possible, it does not yet follow that such a condition is wholly undesirable. For the greater the profit to the manufacturer the greater the possible wage to labor. And if there be an excess in price, a profit over and above that which would exist under a system of greater competition, this in itself enables labor to exact and secure a larger wage. The whole underlying theory of our tariff system is to prevent as far as possible our people coming into direct and unrestricted competition with the pauper populations of foreign countries. The principle in the one case is directly applicable to the other. For if it be true that a protective tariff which enables a manufacturer to obtain a better price for his product in the home market than he could otherwise secure also enables him to pay a higher rate of wage, it necessarily follows that if monopoly is able to secure a higher price it also can afford a greater wage. Nor is it any answer to say that as no higher wage is paid under the tariff system so no greater would be received, even though a larger price

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was secured by monopoly. For as to tariff the statement is not true in point of fact; and even were the contrary the case it is immaterial to this discussion, for if it be admitted that labor does not receive its just share of profit this fact does not depend upon similar considerations; it involves different principles and requires other and further remedies. Though believed to be wholly unwarranted in point of fact, it may for the purpose of argument be admitted that no manufacturer, monopolistic or otherwise, will willingly give up any greater proportion of his profit than he is compelled to. Surely, however, this does not obviate the necessity of creating the profit before arranging for its division. All will agree that before there can be any just or other divisions the profit itself must first be created and obviously the larger the profit the more to divide.

It is upon labor more than upon any other class of our citizens that unrestricted competition lays its heavy hand. The great industrial problem which this generation must solve, and solve correctly, is believed to be the formulation of some plan whereby reserving individual freedom, initiative, and independence, labor will yet be relieved from the present necessity of coming into such cruel and unrestricted competition with itself; but of this more will be said in a subsequent article. The only point here sought to be made is that such slight occasional and temporary increase in the price of monopoly-controlled commodities, if such would in fact be the result, is not necessarily of itself to be deplored and need cause no great alarm.

Though not strictly pertinent to this discussion, as pointed out in a previous article, the fixing of maximum prices beyond which trust commodities may not be sold in no way tends to preserve that competition so ardently desired by one school of political thought. It is of no assistance to the independent in any field of industry. Competition is eliminated by underselling, not by overselling the market. To secure the business, trust prices must be met. To lower these by governmental action makes still sharper competition. It is only by establishing minimum rates, thus preventing the independent from being undersold, that he can be at all aided. Surely no one would advocate the fixing of a minimum rate below which a commodity might not be sold to the end that some one or more engaged in a similar industry might derive profit thereby. Not only then does

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there seem to be no apparent necessity for the proposed legislation, but even its working practicability may well be doubted.

Let us suppose that a Commodity Court has in fact been organized, composed, say, of five members and with jurisdiction to fix maximum charges, beyond which no person or corporation engaged in interstate commerce, and who has acquired a monopoly or partial monopoly, may sell his or its products. Let us assume that this court has been given power to issue subpœnas, compel the attendance of witnesses, punish for contempt, and enforce its decrees in the same manner and under like circumstances with other courts. How is its machinery to be set in motion? Is it to be by complaint of any individual who thinks the price of nails manufactured at Cincinnati should be the same at New Orleans as at St. Louis? Or is its jurisdiction only to be invoked by government? If the latter, at whose instigation must government act and under what circumstances? If the former, the court will not be without business.

To what extent must any given article be trust-tainted before it falls within the jurisdiction of the court? Must the alleged monopoly be complete or only partial? If the former, will the jurisdiction end when some independent, no matter how insignificant, shall have entered the field? If the latter, to what extent? Will it be necessary to show that the corporation complained of does thirty or sixty or ninety per cent. of the entire business of the country in the given commodity under investigation?

Mr. Bryan once suggested that no corporation be permitted to handle more than fifty per cent. of the total business of the country in any given industrial field. Suppose, for the sake of any better, this figure be taken as an experimental working basis for the first "legislative tinkering" upon the subject, though, as has been pointed out, it is obvious that the manufacture and control of fifty per cent. will not and cannot either fix or maintain the selling price. The United States Steel Corporation manufacturing sixty per cent. of the steel rails of the country, and thus clearly within the jurisdiction of the court upon this specific commodity, is cited, let us say, to appear and show cause, if any it has, why the price of rails should not be reduced from thirty to twenty-five dollars per ton. Thirty dollars is and has been the market price. After a full hearing, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

court is of the opinion that this price is unreasonable and excessive and orders the reduction prayed for in the bill of complaint. Will the independents now be permitted to realize thirty, while the United States Steel is compelled to sell at twenty-five? Of course it is no answer to say that the market will immediately drop to twenty-five, for there may not be sufficient steel rails on hand or capable of manufacture by the Steel Corporation to supply the demand. If compelled to sell at twenty-five—to whom, it may be asked? To those who first made demand or will every one desiring the product be entitled to share ratably in this court-granted windfall? If the former, in what particular form must the demand be made so as to render it binding and obligatory upon the vendor? If the latter, will the division be according to necessity or speculative desire? How long will the order of reduction remain in force? If by reason of sudden rise in the price of raw material or labor, or such unusual demand as necessitates overtime operations with their attendant increase in the cost of production, must there be a reinvestigation, or may the corporation itself be the judge as to whether or not the order should be modified? When once sold by the trust, will the article be relieved in the hands of the purchaser of its original taint to the end that it may be resold by the first vendee at what price he wills, or shall it still remain impressed with its original character of trust-produced commodity? Obviously, if the former policy is presumed, it enables the trust to sell to its favored few, who may then resell at what price they will; while if the latter is adopted the whole doctrine of the absolute right of private ownership of personal property becomes abandoned. Must the commodity be sold for the same price in all the markets of the country, or will a base price be fixed at the place of production and the manufacturer be permitted to add to this the cost of transportation to the point of ultimate sale? What becomes of long-time contracts? Will the vendees be given the benefit of any reduction made by the court in the selling price? What of warranties? May a trust-tainted commodity be sold at a greater price if its efficiency and durability are guaranteed? If so, for what per cent. of excess?

Again, what will be the standard measure or principle upon which it will be adjudged that a given price is reasonable and proper or unreasonably excessive and extortionate?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will the measure be a given rate of interest upon the capital invested? If so, how much? Will it be ten or twenty or thirty per cent. or the average interest value of money loaned on good security? Will any allowance be made for or premium placed upon efficient and economical management, system, or order, or will such economy in production mean simply a decreased selling price? If the former, how much, translated into figures? If the latter, to what extent will inefficient management, extravagance, and want of order and system be allowed as an excuse for a higher selling price than would otherwise be permitted? Will the permissible basis of profit be upon the physical valuation of the property employed in production or upon the price paid by the public for the securities? If the former, the great industrials must collapse, for in their several plans of consolidation so great have been the prices paid for bonuses, commissions, and good will that unless the per cent. of profit be fixed at a very high figure these combinations would find themselves unable to pay the interest on their bonds, much less earn dividends for their stock. Such a policy would mean simply an outright confiscation of the funds of hundreds of thousands of innocent stockholders who have invested their savings in these securities in the utmost good faith. If, on the other hand, the price paid by the public is to form the basis of the authorized profit, there would seem to be no necessity for the proposed legislation. For it is to be remembered that the monopolistic trusts are not privately owned concerns. They are not close corporations whose stocks, parceled out among the few, lie in safety boxes secure from onslaught. The great industrials, like the railroads, are owned by the public. Their interest-bearing bonds, their preferred and common stocks, are offered for sale in all the great markets of the world. He who thinks their profits excessive may participate therein, thus reimbursing himself for any overcharge which may have been imposed by reason of his consumption of manufactured articles; the laborer, the clerk, the farmer who has saved one hundred dollars, the public at large, all may share.

Will the power of the court extend to labor when it has become unionized in the same proportion to the total as shall be determined to be sufficient to give the court jurisdiction over the commodity? Will the court decree a price beyond which labor shall not charge for its services? If so, what

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will be the principle upon which this decision will be made to rest? What is a reasonable wage for labor? These are all pertinent and important practical questions which must be answered by the legislature, for it is hardly to be expected that Congress will ever vest in any tribunal the jurisdiction proposed without rule or guide, standard measure or principle, other than the whim and caprice of the court. Unless, of course, the reign of law is to be utterly abandoned for that of men.

It has been suggested as one of the principal reasons for the proposed legislation that some tribunal be created from which business might secure advance and authoritative information as to what it could or could not do. It is hard to conceive of a doctrine more un-American in its principle. It is little removed from absolutism. A body with power to say to one set of men "you may," to another "you may not." To one corporation "you may engage in this enterprise to this limited extent," to another "you shall not." Desperate indeed must be a situation which evokes such suggestion. Better had we in the first instance elect some able, industrious, and benign prince whose will shall be ultimate law. It is to be hoped that neither the American people nor business, big or small, will so far surrender their prerogatives as to place themselves in the position of asking any court or commission what they may or may not do. What the law permits they may do, from what it prohibits they must abstain.

But it will be said that the same objections now set forth were urged against the Interstate Commerce and the several State Railway and Public Utility Commissions and that experience has demonstrated them unsound. The suggestion would be conclusive if there was no distinction between the operation of the proposed Commodity Court and these Commissions. Such, however, is not the case. The difference is fundamental. In the case of Commissions fixing rates for public utilities all are treated alike. No sooner does a new carrier spring into existence than automatically it comes under the jurisdiction of the Commission. The rules that are applied to all others are extended to it. There is no discrimination; telephone and telegraph companies, water and lighting plants, all transportation companies operating in the same area are in law upon an equal footing. In the case of the proposed Commodity Court, all en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gaged in the same field of industry are not to be within its jurisdiction. There will be independents not subject to its rules or regulations. It is as if the Great Northern Railway were within the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Northern Pacific without. In fixing the maximum charges for the grain elevators of Chicago the legislature of Illinois made no discrimination; all were equally within the law. So these public utilities, clothed with quasi-governmental powers within their spheres of operation, are monopolies in fact. The world's competition, the natural laws of trade, do not operate upon them as directly or potentially (often not at all) as in the manufacture and distribution of the ordinary articles of commerce. Nor does it at all follow that because it has proven expedient for government to control and regulate public utilities the same result would be accomplished by a similar control over the prices of commodities.

It has been suggested that an appeal be allowed from the proposed court. If so, to what tribunal? Will it be to the District Courts of the United States or to some Circuit Court of Appeals. Will the Supreme Court, in addition to its already overwhelming burdens, be compelled to at times abandon the realm of law and enter upon a minute investigation of all the various prices of production? If there is to be any ultimate review by the courts the jurisdiction had as well be there placed in the first instance, giving to the vendee of the commodity in question the right of private action for any unreasonable excess in purchase price, thus rendering the courts not only law tribunals, but also *administrators for the more equitable distribution of personal property.*

In view of the foregoing considerations, it would seem that the suggestion of a Commodity Court or Commission with the jurisdiction and powers proposed is not only unnecessary, but utterly impracticable, except with such fundamental changes and modification of commercial intercourse as would meet the approval of no one. *Surely there must be some other solution.*

ALBERT FINK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MUSE OF THE INCOMMUNICABLE

BY GEORGE STERLING

An echo often have our singers caught
And they that bend above the saddened strings;
One hue of all the hundreds on her wings
Our painters render, and our men of thought
In realms mysterious her face have sought
And glimpsed its marvel in elusive things:
Her shadow gathers and her fragrance clings
To all the loveliness that man has wrought.

The wind of lonely places is her wine.
Still she evades us, hidden, hushed, and fleet—
A star withheld, a music in the gloom.
Beauty and death her speechless lips assign,
Where silence is, and where the surf-loud feet
Of armies wander on the sands of doom.

BY THE SEA

BY ROBERT STANLEY WEIR

Dreaming upon the sands I lift mine eyes to gaze
Beyond the infinite and heaving blue;
The far horizon, blurred in cloud and haze,
Bends o'er some beach (I muse) a thousand leagues from view.
"And there," saith Fancy, "looking toward these sands,
Wistful like thee, an unknown dreamer stands!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE QUALITY OF MARVELL'S POETRY

BY FRANCIS BICKLEY

Modern criticism—with an ardor sometimes disproportioned to its theme—has been a busy maker of reputations. We grow more catholic, seeing that art is a house of many mansions; but toleration has not been the only motive at work. In the trade of letters competition grows ever keener, and the tradesman's best chance of profit lies in the display of strange wares. So poets who have long languished in obscurity have been brought with a flourish to the light. Some of them surely must have blinked beneath its unexpected beams.

Not that the literary discoverer is a bad citizen. All men who have lived are interesting more or less, and that some have written verse does not necessarily diminish their interest. To have rescued the seventeenth century from the dark night cast over it by the eighteenth is a pious and admirable work: by no means the least noble manifestation of the nineteenth century's vaunted progress. It is only that to hail every calf-bound duodecimo raked from the two-penny box as a precious casket of genius is to set our minor poets too low a standard. But the pseudo-great, ancient or modern, will soon sink into a decent oblivion.

So it comes about that there are few poets who can claim that they lack at least their due meed of worship. But there are just one or two who have listened in vain, if not for the trumpet, at least for the answering shout. Andrew Marvell is one of them. He is possibly the most undervalued of our poets.

True, he has his place, with many a lesser man, in the *Muses' Library,* and so can be bought for a florin. Dr. Grosart, an enthusiast but a pedant, edited him completely, prose and verse, in four bulky and inaccessible volumes, the hundred possessors whereof must needs be muscular as well

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as wealthy. Somewhat tardily the Ministry has honored him with admission to the *English Men of Letters;* but Mr. Birrell, while writing an admirable biography of the politician and satirist, pecks but cautiously at criticism of the artist. The new *Cambridge History,* though discreetly appreciative, gives him a curious position as a kind of makeweight in a chapter devoted to Bunyan.

If Marvell were merely of the rank and file of his age, such recognition would be enough. The modern discovery of such charming singers as Waller and Carew and Suckling is an excellent thing, if only as a symptom that we have at last got free from the stupendous solemnity of the romantic revival and are not utterly engulfed in the solemnity of modern problems; that we have learned that greatness and gravity are not identical in art. But we should not lay too great a stress on these men's importance. Give them a tray in the window as good specimens of Ben's progeny, but don't put them in the central showcase to jostle their betters.

Marvell, however, is in quite another class than Carew or Suckling. Yet, in the matter of editing, appreciation, and so forth, he has had much the same treatment. In this he has been unfairly used. One other man, roughly of his era, is roughly his equal. At an Elysian banquet of poets of the Cavalier and Puritan age Herrick and Marvell should be set on either hand of John Milton, their president. Herrick has his due. For a time forgotten, then recognized for a pretty singer, he has now his place in the van of the English lyrists. It is admitted that if one considers the "Nativity Ode" a better poem than the "Nightpiece to Julia," it is a matter of taste rather than of weight and measure. Herrick is of the elect. But Marvell must still take his chance with the ruck.

One does not desire to establish him among the mighty. But he has certain qualities which call for wider recognition. All but very few of the poets whom we honor are only great in moments more or less frequent. Coleridge, who touched perfection in "Kubla Khan," was the author of I know not what dreariness. Longfellow, who doddered at such inordinate length, was a great poet when he wrote "My Lost Youth." Marvell is another of the intermittent great. He might be compared with Marlowe. He is as far below Milton as Marlowe is below Shakespeare. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Elizabethan produced much gaudy fustian, the Puritan elaborated many empty conceits. But each scaled sudden heights, each had his moments of insight. Marlowe once saw Helen more clearly than any Greek. Marvell, the Puritan (some said the Republican), had a nobler vision of Charles than was vouchsafed to the most loyal Cavalier. In lines among the few of his that have become common quotation he re-created the King in the high-handed way of the great artist; in the way of Wordsworth with Chatterton, of Swinburne with François Villon.

"He nothing common did, or mean,
Upon that memorable scene,
But with his keener eye
The axe's edge did try;

"Nor called the gods, with vulgar spite,
To vindicate his helpless right;
But bowed his comely head
Down, as upon a bed."

This directness of statement, an absolute rightness of touch based on an absolute sureness of vision, is a high virtue in poetry and one of the rarest. Poets the loftiest in spirit and the wealthiest in words have almost or altogether lacked it. The poets of the romantic revolt, for instance, with all their splendor, achieved it only at long intervals; for in their attitude something of the argumentative was implied which made against this divine certitude. Yet it is a quality of the romantics. The eighteenth century, which stated its opinions in couplets, knew nothing of this or any other poetic quality except the art of getting a high polish on their phrases. But Milton, the truest classic among our poets, also lacked the gift of sudden inevitability. No English poet comes anywhere near him in general perfection. None says what he wants to say with so calm and melodious an assurance. But he misses just the final something. This, as Matthew Arnold held, is the difference between classic and romantic. The classic with his watchful art, his nine years' solicitude, makes his work as perfect as hand and brain can contrive. The romantic contents himself with faulty work while he waits—I will not say the inspiration—but the impulse to expression which seems transcendental in its aptitude.

Marvell partook of the nature both of the classic and of the romantic. In some poems he has the romantic's faults

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and rare triumphs or the faults without the triumphs. In others he is wholly classic in his chaste and chiseled accuracy. Once, at least, he is both in one poem. "The Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland" will, according to Dean Trench, "give a truer notion of the kind of greatness which he [Horace] achieved than could, as far as I know, be obtained from any other poem in our language." It is indeed a stately panegyric of a man whose opinions and achievements the poet respected. But when he has to speak of a man whose opinions he dislikes, but whose personality is one of those which fascinate the imaginative in their own despite, a sudden wave of enthusiasm uplifts him and impels him to the magic of the lines quoted.

This mixture of classical and romantic was common enough in the Renaissance poets. But whereas by Marvell's time the classical was fast gaining ground, Marvell was more romantic not only than his contemporaries, but than the majority of his predecessors. He sounds certain notes which will not be heard again in English literature until the days of Coleridge and Shelley. Shakespeare's "wood-notes wild," Herrick's songs of country pleasures, have not that intimacy with impersonal nature which makes Marvell seem so modern.

Divers influences shaped Marvell. He was educated at the Hull Grammar School under his father, a good scholar who grounded him in the classics, and at Trinity College, Cambridge. He wrote verses both Latin and Greek. He knew his Horace, as we have seen, and also his Catullus. Sparrows and fawns can hardly be called akin, but the pets of Lesbia and of Marvell's nymph might at least have come from the same fanciers.

> "For it was full of sport, and light
> Of foot and heart; and did invite
> Me to its game; it seemed to bless
> Itself in me; how could I less
> Than love it? O, I cannot be
> Unkind t'a beast that loveth me."

These lines can scarcely be the work of one who did not remember

> "Nam mellitus erat, suamque norat
> Ipsam tam bene quam puella matrem.
> Nec sese a gremio illius movebat,
> Sed circumsiliens modo huc modo illuc
> Ad solam dominam usque pipiebat."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marvell, like most of his fellows, felt the influence of Donne's potent personality. Conceit was a fashion which it took a stronger man than he to ignore. There are conceits in his verse in plenty, as when he says that "Jubal tuned Music's Jubilee," and writes of "music, the mosaic of the air." Nor need we admire such things. There is no need to school our historical sense to appreciate Donne when our sense of beauty has Jonson and Herrick and Milton ready to hand. Donne was a man of daring conceptions which he only marred by his tricksy style. There is a dateless language which has been written by all the greatest poets and calls for no chronological posturing to feel at ease with it. Those who do not use that language are the less worthy of our homage. They may have much in them that is admirable, but undue exaltation of such men of their age as Donne and Sir Thomas Browne is sentimental antiquarianism.

Marvell, however, had a natural directness of expression which largely counteracted these crooked influences. He who could write the last four lines of "Bermudas"—

> "Thus sang they, in the English boat,
> An holy and a cheerful note;
> And all the way, to guide their chime,
> With falling oars they kept the time—"

was hardly the man seriously to disfigure any large proportion of his work with tortuous conceits. Still, many of his poems are of the "metaphysical" order. "The Match," "Mourning," and others are overweighted with the faults of the school. But sometimes when Marvell has had conceptions of the Donnesque order and translated them into Donne's symbolism, he has in the actual writing purified them with his own simplicity. The result is a poem as vast, picturesque, and lucid as "To his Coy Mistress," which contains the lines,

> "But at my back I always hear
> Time's wingèd chariot hurrying near."

This is the second of the "familiar quotations" from Marvell, but the whole passage (a third part of the poem) is of equal felicity. It has almost all the virtues and almost none of the faults of a phase of English poetry of which it is a typical example.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"But at my back I always hear
Time's wingèd chariot hurrying near,
And yonder all before us lie
Deserts of vast eternity.
Thy beauty shall no more be found,
Nor, in thy marble vault, shall sound
My echoing song; then worms shall try
That long-preserved virginity,
And your quaint honor turn to dust,
And into ashes all my lust:
The grave's a fine and private place,
But none, I think, do there embrace."

It cannot be claimed that the language of this is dateless, but its topical flavor does not weigh heavier than the idea, which is an universal one. Similarly composed are "Daphnis and Chloe," so old-fashioned in its conception, so modern in its astringent humor, and the less satisfactory "Definition of Love" with its magnificent beginning:

"My love is of a birth as rare
As 'tis, for object, strange and high;
It was begotten by Despair,
Upon Impossibility."

"Daphnis and Chloe" is, unfortunately, too long to quote in full and too climactic to quote in part, but there is probably no poem of Marvell's which gives one greater joy to read.

Lightness, the one thing lacking in our nineteenth-century great; butterfly-winged in Shakespeare's songs and in Herrick; the predominant virtue of the Caroline singers, varying from sheer faery to sheer frivolity; not quite gone (though sadly materialized) even at the Restoration; last heard in Prior; this lightness often makes Marvell's verse charming. "Daphnis and Chloe," though wasp rather than butterfly, is at any rate winged; and winged and stingless are the dainty dialogues between Clorinda and Damon, Thyrsis and Dorinda, Hobbinol, Phillis, and Tomalin (for Mary Cromwell's Wedding), and Ametas and Thestylis at their hay-rope. This last is short as well as sweet:

AMETAS. "Think'st thou that this love can stand,
Whilst thou still dost say me nay?
Love unpaid does soon disband:
Love binds love, as hay binds hay."

THESTYLIS. "Think'st thou that this rope would twine,
If we both should turn one way?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where both parties so combine,
Neither love will twist, nor hay."

AMETAS. "Thus you vain excuses find,
Which yourself and us delay:
And love ties a woman's mind
Looser than with ropes of hay."

THESTYLIS. "What you cannot constant hope
Must be taken as you may."

AMETAS. "Then let's both lay by our rope,
And go kiss within the hay."

It is a slight note, but one the world did ill to lose. It was sounded by no light scorner of the realities, but by a man immersed in affairs and earnestly concerned with the problems of religion and government. Love, the state, and the soul came alike to the ready lyre of the seventeenth century; and Marvell was as varied in his themes as any, and more varied in his touch than most. The form so prettily used for pastoral colloquy was transformed into the vehicle of sound if not very original moralizing in the dialogues between the Resolved Soul and Created Pleasure and between the Soul and the Body. The fine lines called "Bermudas," referring to the emigrants driven thither by Laud, were inspired by Marvell's hatred of Episcopalian tyranny, though he was ever a faithful, if independent, son of the Established Church.

Love is seen in many ways; never more beautifully than in the allied and exquisite poems "The Picture of Little T. C. in a Prospect of Flowers" and "Young Love." Political interests produced, if they did not perfect, the "Horatian Ode" and called forth some pages of dignified couplets on the Protector's death and Blake's victory at Santa Cruz. After the Restoration they seduced the poet to satire; but Marvell, though his was the better cause, has left nothing that lives with "Hudibras" and "Absalom and Achitophel." His satires, inspired by a fine enthusiasm —shame at the Dutch in the Medway, horror of the corruption at Court—are written with tremendous vigor and often in language unsuited to the nice modern ear. They served their turn. But they have neither Dryden's finality and dignity nor the babbling wit which makes Butler still readable because he is so easy to read.

The finest of Marvell's poems in decasyllabic couplets is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that prefixed to the 1674 edition of "Paradise Lost." It is a noble tribute from a poet to his friend and superior, is an excellent piece of criticism, and has a sting in its tail for Dryden. It may here be noted that at one time Milton, Dryden, and Marvell were all working in the same office of the Council of State. Not even when Mr. Dobson and Mr. Gosse were concocting rondeaux at the Board of Trade (as Mr. Beerbohm has portrayed them) was so much poetic talent ever gathered into a government office before or since.

But apart from exceptional passages, such as the royal stanzas of the "Horatian Ode," the quality which separates Marvell from his contemporaries and lifts him, as it were, right over the eighteenth century is his almost mystical *rapport* with nature.

It is true that there are no stark mountain-tops or troubled seas in his work; his is the kindlier nature of the garden. It was an age of garden-lovers. Bacon, Cowley, and Temple spanned the century. Marvell, as literary horticulturalist, makes a worthy fourth. The garden looms large in his poems. Cromwell comes "from his private gardens" to his great work. The poet had every opportunity of cultivating the taste. He was born at Winstead in Holderness. "Roses still riot in Winstead," says Mr. Birrell; "the fruit-trees are as many as in the seventeenth century." The garden of Hull Grammar School was famous; so was that at Nunappleton House, where Marvell lived as tutor to Fairfax's daughter and probably wrote most of his poetry. Thus the poet wandered from garden to garden, learning their secret.

The garden may be the antithesis of nature. But the garden which Marvell loved was not so. It was no place of balanced *parterres* and clipped hedges, but a spot where the earth's fruitfulness is intensified rather than selected.

> "Ripe apples drop about my head;
> The luscious clusters of the vine
> Upon my mouth do crush their wine;
> The nectarine and curious peach
> Into my hands themselves do reach;
> Stumbling on melons, as I pass,
> Insnared with flowers, I fall on grass."

"My fruits are only flowers," he says elsewhere, but here in his garden poem *par excellence* the fruits are plentiful enough. The last two lines are suggestive of a tropical for-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

est. In one poem, indeed, he goes so far as to inveigh against the gardener's art; but this is one of a charming series for which Damon the Mower is made responsible and in any case does not amount to more than an indictment of too much artifice. Marvell's garden was a "delicious solitude" of rich grass and fruitful trees. Above all, it was a green place.

In "The Nymph Complaining for the Death of her Fawn" he describes a girl's delightful pleasaunce—

> "So with roses overgrown,
> And lilies, that you would it guess
> To be a little wilderness";

and for a score of lines he rings the changes on white and pink, reminding one of Jacopo del Sellaio's Venus in the National Gallery.

> "I have through every garden been
> Amongst the red, the white, the green,"

he writes elsewhere; but in the famous "Garden,"

> "No white nor red was ever seen
> So amorous as this lovely green."

Taken by themselves, these lines suggest nothing more than a feeling for color. It is only when one has read right through Marvell's work that one realizes the intense significance which green things had for him. Time and again the word occurs, as substantive or adjective, and always with a curious pregnancy. One does not credit him with the definite vagueness, or the vague definition, of a modern symbolist; but it is obvious that *green* was his shorthand for something he could not quite describe, an ecstasy which came on him among grass and moss and trees. It colors his couplets on Appleton House and invests a long and rather tedious poem with a certain glamour. "The nursery of all things green" he calls Eden, the mother of gardens. Elusive, colorless things, shadows, and thoughts are green for him. In "The Garden" the overripe, too solid stanza about apples and melons is followed by his most subtle and suggestive lines:

> "Meanwhile the mind, from pleasure less,
> Withdraws into its happiness:
> The mind, that ocean where each kind
> Does straight its own resemblance find:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet it creates, transcending these,
Far other worlds, and other seas,
Annihilating all that's made
To a green thought in a green shade."

One might search Shelley and Meredith in vain for a more perfect expression of the mystical union between man and nature. The next stanza is more explicit.

"Here at the fountain's sliding foot,
Or at some fruit-tree's mossy root,
Casting the body's vest aside,
My soul into the boughs does glide:
There, like a bird, it sits and sings,
Then whets and combs its silver wings,
And, till prepared for longer flight,
Waves in its plumes the various light."

This idea of metamorphosis occurs also in "Appleton House":

"Thus I, easy philosopher,
Among the birds and trees confer;
And little now to make me wants
Or of the fowls, or of the plants:
Give me but wings as they, and I
Straight floating on the air shall fly;
Or turn me but, and you shall see
I was but an inverted tree."

There is nothing very remarkable about either of these two passages. They might be mere flights of fancy. But taken in connection with the rest of Marvell's work, read while his sudden flashes of insight are remembered (one of which, indeed, the first immediately follows), they appear as attempts at an intellectual description of the experiences of a wonderful imaginative sympathy. An understanding which is more than mere aptitude for simile went to the making of such lines as,

"He hangs in shades the orange bright,
Like golden lamps in a green night";

or

"While the youthful hue
Sits on thy skin like morning dew."

This imaginative quality is by no means omnipresent in Marvell's poetry, but it is there in sufficient volume to be a strong element in the final impression which that poetry leaves; and it links him with Marlowe and Shakespeare on the one hand, with Coleridge and Shelley on the other, rather

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than with those who were of his own age and in many external characteristics his kin.

His poems were little more than an episode in Marvell's busy life, and he did not even publish them. It was not until three years after his death that a volume of his verse was given to the world. All his best work was probably done while he was in the pleasant and stimulating company of the Fairfaxes. His latter days were almost songless. Affairs claimed him. First as Milton's assistant in the Latin secretaryship, and then for eighteen years as a silent but conscientious member of Parliament, he had little time for strolling in green garden ways.

His pen was by no means dry. The weekly letters which he wrote to his constituents at Hull are valuable documents for the parliamentary history of the period. After the Restoration he used much black and bitter ink in satire and controversy. He was the most brilliant journalist of the Country Party. But though "The Rehearsal Transprosed" and "The Last Instructions to a Painter" are still interesting, they are journalism and nothing higher. The lines on Milton are the noblest work of his later years, but even they have the taint of party feeling.

It is obvious that Marvell was extremely sensitive to his environment. He was not one of those who can write of roses in Grub Street. In the thick of politics he became perforce a pamphleteer; it was only on the shaded lawns of Appleton that he could be a poet. His poems are as few as his years of rural peace. But if this responsiveness to his surroundings conditioned and limited his production, it was also precisely that which gave to what he did write its intimate magic.

FRANCIS BICKLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PHILLIPS BROOKS AND GERMAN PREACHING

BY FRANCIS G. PEABODY

PHILLIPS BROOKS died just twenty years ago, on January 23, 1893. It is difficult for those who listened to him with such profound emotion to realize that a new generation has arrived, which, if it reads his sermons at all, cannot hear in them the searching cadences and torrential energy which moved every heart. "He rose," Mr. Bryce once said, "in his first few sentences like a strong-winged bird, into a serene atmosphere of meditation, stilling and thrilling the crowd. The listeners never thought of style or manner, but only of the substance of the thought. They were entranced and carried out of themselves by the strength and sweetness and beauty of the aspects of religious truth which he presented." To those who thus remember him he will always be the prince of preachers; and they hear with something like consternation the comments of younger readers who are inclined to find Phillips Brooks fanciful, exuberant, or diffuse.

Much, it must be admitted, has happened in these few years to diminish general interest in his message. The social interpretation of religion, which is now so compelling, was hardly approached by him. It is true that in one chapter of the volume which his biographer regards as the most important of his writings, the *Lectures on the Influence of Jesus,* the correlation of Christianity with social service is foreshadowed and welcomed; yet these lectures, partly perhaps because of their academic form, have never received the general attention which they still deserve. The overwhelming effect of his preaching has obscured the importance of this theological confession; and his preaching, it must be admitted, does not strike the note which is domi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nant to-day. He was primarily, not a reformer, but a revealer. He lived at the end of the nineteenth century rather than at the beginning of the twentieth. His message was not so much of the duty of man in the service of the world as of the life of God in the soul of man.

The movement of ecclesiastical interest during the last twenty years has contributed to this decline of Brooks's authority. He was in his theology an Evangelical and in his practice a broad Churchman; and both in the Church of England and in the Protestant Episcopal Church, to which he was so loyally devoted, neither the Evangelical nor the Broad Church party is now in control. Phillips Brooks had indeed little interest in any ecclesiastical movement. The Christian Church was to him a means rather than an end. "I care less and less for organization," he said when on the point of being made a bishop. His supreme concern was for the individual soul. He had what the author of *Ecce Homo* called, in Jesus Christ, a passion for personality; and this search for the one sheep that was lost made him, as it made his Master, indifferent to distinctions which to many of his brethren seemed of vital concern. Questions of priesthood or ritual, the assumption of a new title by his communion as the American Church—in short, the whole structure of exclusive authority and tradition—seemed to him an unauthorized limitation of the grace of God; and as the movement toward a "Catholic" position has advanced, it has left Phillips Brooks behind, or at least on one side.

This obscuration of his teaching has been increased, so far as Boston is concerned, by the nature of the monument erected to commemorate his work; and it is certainly one of the ironies of local history that before the Church which still echoes with his words there should stand a memorial which so ingeniously misrepresents him. Dismissing from consideration the problems of art which this much-discussed statue has provoked—whether the symbolic Christ dwarfs the preacher's figure, whether the canopy crushes the group, or whether the anatomy is faulty—what must future generations conclude from the study of this statue concerning the preacher's manner and method? A boyish, not to say bumptious, orator, thickset and stumpy, is brandishing his right arm with a hortatory gesture, while behind him a veiled Christ is directing his message. Could anything be more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unacceptable to Phillips Brooks than such an interpretation of his purpose? No hearer, it is safe to say, ever saw him in the attitude portrayed. He rarely used any gesture, save the quick toss of the head and the pressure of the hand against his side. His weapon of communication was not the brandishing arm, but the flashing eye. He scorned the arts of oratory and practised the higher art of restraint. It would be as reasonable to portray a rushing river making conscious gestures as to represent Phillips Brooks in an oratorical pose. As to the veiled Christ, it may be fairly said that the preaching of Phillips Brooks was habitually directed to free the Church from so ghostly and dehumanized a conception of its Master. The veil, he might have said with the Apostle Paul, is "taken away at the reading of the New Testament." If the symbolism of this ascetic figure, instead of suggesting, as is intended, the inspiration of the preacher, were designed to indicate a fruitless attempt to detain him in the grasp of mediævalism, it would be more consistent with the facts. To compare this veiled figure with Brooks's teaching on "The influence of Jesus" is like passing from darkness to dawn.

It may be still further urged that the decline in Brooks's influence is due to the special limitations of his work, and that a preacher must anticipate the fate of temporariness. The more immediate and personal his message is, the more transient may be its reputation. When one recalls the history of the pulpit in New England during the nineteenth century, he may not unreasonably conclude that out of the thousands of preachers who have faithfully served their generations only two names survive which represent permanent contributions to religious progress. Channing and Bushnell dealt habitually with great themes on a great scale. The nature of God and man, the dignity of human nature and its ruins, the evidences of Christianity, and the intimations of immortality—sermons on themes like these, preached by great masters, became not so much contemporary influences as historical monuments. These exceptions, however, seem to prove the rule concerning preaching. The vast majority of preachers must be content to have their day and cease to be; to live by faith in that occasional alchemy which transforms preaching into character and makes a word into flesh. Sermons are prepared, not to be read, but to be heard. The touch of personality and intimacy which may give a ser-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mon its immediate authority is precisely what the reader, beyond the reach of eye or voice, may not be able to feel. No literature is likely to become more desiccated than the volumes of sermons, whose publication grateful parishioners promote, leaving to their children the pious duty of transferring to the nearest theological library their uncut and dusty copies, as if in obedience to the maxim which has been suggested as a guide to modern charity: Give what you do not want to others who do not want it. The difference between readers and hearers may be illustrated, even in the case of Phillips Brooks, by the impression which he made on reviewers and on listeners in England. In October, 1884, the London *Spectator,* in a somewhat patronizing notice of his printed sermons, said:

"Mr. Brooks's whole treatment of religion is too fanciful and casual; . . . he gives much that is valuable, much that is wise, much that is ingenious and thoughtful, but he does not strengthen the foundations of religious thought. Mr. Brooks is a fine preacher of the second class."

It was, however, but a few years before British hearers came to share the judgment of the United States and great congregations hung on his words with such passionate interest that in 1890 Professor A. B. Bruce, of Glasgow, on being asked how Brooks should be compared with English preachers, said:

"It is this way: Our great preachers take into the pulpit a bucket full, or half full, of the word of God and then by the force of personal mechanism they attempt to carry it to the congregation. But this man is just a great water-main attached to the everlasting reservoir of God's truth and grace and love; and streams of life, by a heavenly gravitation, pour through him to refresh every weary soul."

Must it, then, be inferred that the type of preaching, of which Brooks was so supreme a master, is to be permanently displaced? Do the new needs of a new century demand a new kind of appeal? Has this message to the individual lost its force in an era of associated action and social remedies? Will congregations listen to nothing but the summons to look out and not in? Must the individual wither as the world grows more and more? American booksellers report that a new and cheap edition of Brooks's sermons has stimulated a sale in the South and West, but that the normal demand has become very limited. Has the fate of temporariness overtaken even the preaching of Phillips Brooks?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These questions are sufficiently answered by the extraordinary welcome given to Brooks's sermons in a German translation; and it is certainly a suggestive incident in literary history that, while the tide of appreciation has gradually ebbed in England and America, it has risen with suddenness and volume where his name and fame have been quite unknown. It may seem surprising that German readers should not long ago have become familiar with so distinguished a teacher. The barrier of language intervenes, however, more seriously than might be supposed. To a German pastor, for example, the study of Schleiermacher would seem as essential a part of professional training as familiarity with Brooks would appear to an American student; yet the German master is probably quite as unknown to most Americans as the American has hitherto been to Germans. Indeed, among the curiosities of modern literary history must be named the types of American religion which have become most familiar to German readers through translation, and the writers who are generally accepted in Germany as representative of American religious thought. Longfellow, it is true, has long been a household name and Emerson has had large acceptance; but of contemporary American writers concerned with the spiritual life, the translation of whose works has reached from twenty-four to forty editions, the names best known in Germany are those of Ralph Waldo Trine and Oliver Scott Marden.

When, however, one recalls the nature of Phillips Brooks's message, it becomes evident that there is a real kinship between it and the best of German preaching. An American listener in German churches is likely to hear much which is sentimental, pietistic, and hortatory, and to miss the qualities of masculine, intellectual, or ethical appeal. The German pastor usually speaks, as the Apostle said, "to edification, exhortation, and comfort." He is often exuberant and emotional instead of vigorous and cogent. It does not, therefore, surprise an American hearer that the type of preaching most familiar in Germany has reduced many congregations to a mere sprinkling of feminine worshipers. This pastoral sentimentalism is, it must be remembered, the product of centuries of tradition. The preacher is the organ of a State Church, and he may reasonably assume that his hearers have been duly instructed in the elements of Christian faith and duty. The Reformed preacher is,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still further, the heir of homiletical methods derived from the mediæval Church, and the note of authority, and even of priestly condescension, may survive in very radical teaching. Yet this tradition, which may tempt small preachers to substitute feeling for thought, is precisely what has given to the classic types of German preaching qualities which a breezy democracy is likely to miss. The first intimation of revolt from Roman authority was in the preaching of the German Mystics; and that summons of the soul from external conformity to personal communion with God has become the characteristic note of German homiletics. Tauler and Eckart were the spiritual ancestors of Schleiermacher and Krummacher, of Tholuck and Rothe. Spiritual introspection, meditation upon experience, or what may be in general called experimental religion, is as conspicuously the theme of German preaching as practical righteousness and the call to social service are the characteristic themes of the American pulpit.

To this tradition of spirituality derived from mediæval preaching must be further added the tradition of Biblical authority derived from the Reformation. What the Church was to Catholics the Bible became to the Reformers. Textual preaching supplanted the earlier homilies. The problem of the preacher became that of Biblical interpretation; and this habit of Biblical exposition still persists even in preachers whose Biblical criticism is most destructive. Each of these hereditary influences has tended to restrict the scope and aim of German preaching. The strain of mysticism has encouraged sentimental oratory; the Biblical method has reduced many sermons to historical reflections. Yet when these two traditions meet in a great mind there must result great preaching. The Biblical method spiritually interpreted; experimental religion historically reinforced; the present built on the past and the past supporting the present; dogma and ritual forgotten in the supreme desire to renew the spirit of Christ in the experience of the disciple; personal piety mated with ample learning—all this is what one finds in the best utterances of the German pulpit. In Schleiermacher, for example, the most versatile and influential of modern theologians, this fusion of feeling and thought became complete. He was philosopher, historian, professor of theology, and reconstructor of the National Church; but in his preaching he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was the interpreter of experience, the searcher of hearts, the translator of Biblical incidents into their spiritual equivalents. Religion, to Schleiermacher, was neither a way of thinking nor a form of action, but an expression of emotion, a communion with God through Christ, a Christian experience. Preaching was the communication of this experience. As the heart thus uttered itself it reproduced in others the experience which it reports. Preaching, from this point of view, is primarily not doctrinal or even ethical, but emotional. It assumes in hearers the ideals which it expresses and by faith in such experience communicates or creates it. "*Pectus facit predicatorem*" might be its motto. The sermon is not a work of art or a contribution to apologetics, but a liturgical act, a factor in worship, a call to life, as though its single text might be, "Because I live, ye shall live also."

This is the way of preaching which may be in general terms contrasted with the dogmatic and didactic types as suggestive. It opens vistas; it shows a way; it kindles a flame; it suggests a path which experience may take. Suggestion is, on the whole, the preacher's most available instrument. It has not the weight or dignity of the best didactic preaching. The sermons of Bishop Butler, of Liddon or Mozeley in England, of Bushnell, Channing, or Munger in the United States, are contributions to the history of thought, milestones of theological progress; but for immediate effectiveness, for the saving of souls, suggestion is the best use of a half-hour. To undertake the logical demonstration of a great truth is, in the first place, to preach a very long sermon and, in the second place, to run great risk of rousing the objector to protest or denial; but to illustrate and adumbrate, to open the door toward a view, to start the hearer's mind toward an interpretation—that is the natural method for the preaching of personal religion, and of this suggestive method the best German preachers are unrivaled masters. Traces of their influence may be found even in the most distinguished types of English preaching. The sermon of Robertson on Prayer, while wholly original in its detailed analysis and its personal confession, bears almost unmistakeable marks of acquaintance with the equally notable sermon of Schleiermacher on the same text and theme.

When one turns from these observations on German

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

homiletics to the preaching of Phillips Brooks he recognizes at once a spiritual kinship. Without intimacy with German models Brooks by temperament and intuition belongs to the German school He was the most suggestive of modern preachers. All his reading, as the extraordinary note-books cited in his biography testify, converged on themes for sermons to be utilized by the method of suggestion. He seldom made a frontal attack upon his subject, but approached it by the strategy of a figure or picture or parable, so that the position was in his hands before its defenders were aware. Instead of making a small theme complicated and abstract, he made a great theme simple and concrete. When a younger preacher expressed his sense of the difficulties of a subject Brooks replied, "We must make it simple"; and that simplicity to which the most difficult theme must be reduced was to him always the simplicity which, as the Apostle's words should be translated, is "toward Christ."

When, therefore, a certain pastor in Lugano discovered for the first time, about four years ago, the sermons of Brooks, he recognized the kinship with the German tradition and proceeded with confidence to arrange a translation of some selected sermons. The first volume was published in 1908, under the title *Ein Ruf in die Höhe,* and the immediate and extraordinary interest which it created led to the publication of a new series in 1911, under the title *Siegeskraft.* Many of the comments of German theologians and pastors on these two volumes are entertaining, both in their appreciation of Brooks and in the opinion prevailing among them of the character of American preaching. A pastor of Basel writes in a Swiss journal:

"The first impression which one receives in the reading of Brooks is one of surprise. We expect from an American something exhilarating and sensational, after the pattern of Henry Ward Beecher, but we find in Brooks a depth, thoroughness, and restraint which are thoroughly German. His sermons, or, as his translator more fitly calls them, his addresses on religion, are no easy reading, and their philosophical discernment and logical development make severe demands on the reader. They are addressed to Christians who think, yet they are thoroughly practical and issue into an earnest appeal to the will."

Another critic writes:

"If we had the impression that American preachers were notable for vulgar and sensational writers, we must now confess that these addresses of Phillips Brooks are both in matter and in force the equals of any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

German collection. They are, however, addresses rather than sermons. The text gives a starting-point, a theme which the speaker develops, not from Biblical, but from personal suggestions. History and criticism are subordinated to psychological analysis. It is a book for those who care little for dogmatic or Biblical authority, but are seekers for God."

To the same effect are many other comments in various magazines and reviews. "These sermons have nothing American about them; one seeks in vain for the sensational and eccentric and finds German depth and thoroughness." "These discourses seem to us to lack the simplicity which sermons need, but as spiritual flights through the regions of Christian knowledge, excursions among the hidden workings of the human heart, studies of the life of the soul, they deserve high appreciation." A village pastor goes farther in his estimate. "How much Brooks has meant to me may be measured by the fact that I have learned English in order to read him. There are, I hear, several volumes of his sermons. The one which I have seen presents great, though not insuperable, difficulties. With enthusiasm and a dictionary one may succeed!" Finally, may be added, what is of genuine importance to German readers, the warm appreciation of the German Emperor, communicated in a conversation with Pastor Krummacher, in the course of which the versatile sovereign took occasion also to commend the Noble Lectures in Harvard University on "The Witness to the Influence of Christ," delivered in 1904 by the Lord Bishop of Ripon.

This recognition of Phillips Brooks in a new environment, where the persuasiveness of his presence is unknown and where one critic speaks of him as still living, may go far to justify the reverent admiration of those who have heard and loved him. His place seems to be fixed, not among the preachers who have their day and cease to be, but among those who are not to be forgotten. Changes in American conditions and in ecclesiastical tendencies may make his voice less heard in the street, but that may be the fault of the street rather than of the preacher. If not in the United States, then somewhere else, and some day surely in this country again, the fundamental needs of the human soul will demand satisfaction at the preacher's hands and will find again in Brooks what those who heard him found.

Preaching, like all arts, has an element of periodicity and must use the material of its own time. Monet and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Maeterlinck and Strauss meet the spiritual craving of the present age, which turns from artificiality, superficiality, and conformity to nature, mystery, and power. In the same manner an age dominated by concern for social problems desires to hear in preaching a new note of social redemption. Yet there remains in art a classic style, a best way, a permanent supremacy. Changes of taste or circumstance do not displace Titian or Shakespeare or Beethoven. Back of the periodicity of art is its still more impressive continuity. Temporariness is the fate of all who deal with temporary themes. Even Beecher, the most versatile and inexhaustible of modern preachers, by the dedication of his gifts to the immediate problems of his own time, has now become a figure of the past, an apostle of liberty for the slave and for the Christian, rather than an interpreter of those unchanging spiritual needs which give to teachers so remote from each other as Thomas-à-Kempis and Pascal, Newman and Martineau, a certain timelessness of influence. No one would now think of translating Beecher into German. As for the multitude of less gifted preachers, who regard contemporary life as a sufficient subject and whose sermons become indistinguishable from talks on current events, nothing but temporariness can be anticipated as their destiny. On a single Saturday, taken at random, the announcements of churches in Boston for the next day contained the following subjects, among others, for discourses: "The religion of social service"; "Can a Christian be a rich man?"; "Whiskey, beer, and wine"; "The most striking lessons of the election"; "Are you worth what you cost?" "Standing at Armageddon to fight for the Lord." To pass from this region of bustling sensationalism into the atmosphere of Brooks's preaching is as when the disciples went up from the gossip of Galilee into a high mountain apart, where the great prophets of the past greeted the new Preacher of the Kingdom. On the serene summit of Christian experience the masters of preaching meet; Chrysostom and Augustine, Tauler and Eckart, Robertson and Newman, Schleiermacher and Caird, the goodly company of the prophets who have escaped the fate of temporariness and preach a timeless message; and in this lofty companionship, of different centuries and creeds, there is a place for the generous and guileless genius of Phillips Brooks.

FRANCIS G. PEABODY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"BORIS GODOUNOFF"

BY KURT SCHINDLER

WITH "Boris Godounoff," a drama of the Russian people, a new type of "historical opera" has been founded; far from the stereotyped pattern of Halévy's and Meyerbeer's ambiguous and artificial creations, this is a work of the simple and compelling logic of a master playwright, in which the great emotional forces, the revolutionizing sentiments of a period are depicted through the medium of music.

There have been great musical geniuses who summed up every development that had gone before; of this type were Bach and Mozart. Then there were those volcanic temperaments, those prophetic minds who definitely formulated new ideals — Monteverde, Gluck, Beethoven, and Wagner, and among these must be included the Russian Moussorgsky, who with clear purpose steered the ship of art, as he said, "unto new shores." Moussorgsky was not only a wonderful composer individually, but behind him lay the unexplored musical wealth of the great Slav nation—a mine of rhythmically and melodically unusual folk-songs; of Byzantine church-chants flavoring of the mysterious early Christian period; of old bard tunes, rhapsodical and full of grandeur; of new and violent vocal inflections rooted in the dialects of a rich and varied language. While Tschaikowsky had adapted his Russian nature to the cosmopolitan surroundings in which he lived, his poor and obscure contemporary (for Moussorgsky was little known outside of Russia till long after his death) built the edifice of his art on purely racial grounds.

It was this intimate love of his own people that led Moussorgsky to base his greatest work, "Boris," on a play by Pushkin, the poet who "took Russia away from the artificiality of the eighteenth century and revealed the possibilities of native material in the native tongue." And as the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intense humanism of Moussorgsky's art made it a graphic reflection of his own experiences as well as of the life of his nation, a knowledge of the man in the artist is essential to an understanding of his work.

Modest Petrovitch Moussorgsky was born in Karevo, a village two hundred miles south of St. Petersburg, on the 28th of March of the year 1839, as the son of simple people belonging to the small nobility. Here he passed his childhood to his tenth year in the midst of fields and forests, the typical Russian landscape, in intimate touch with nature and the life of the peasants. His father and mother were both very musical, and his mother it was who first taught him the piano. The young Moussorgsky had a strong and vivid imagination which was nourished by the Russian fairy-tales, so highly colored and barbarically gorgeous in their picturing, which he heard from the lips of his "Njanja," the nurse. At an early age he used to sit down and improvise at the piano on these fairy-tales. The devotion of the boy to his mother was of the tenderest kind. In later years he used to speak of her as "a saint," and his impressive cradle song is inscribed to her memory. In 1849, when he was ten years old, his father sent him to St. Petersburg, where he first went to a preparatory school, later to a high school for noblemen. He kept on with his piano studies, developing a remarkable proficiency; and through an old priest, who taught him in religion, he came to know about the old Greek liturgical chants and about the music of the Roman Catholic Church, a knowledge which benefited him much in later years. He also learned German and Latin and showed marked interest for the study of history, of German philosophy and psychology. When, in 1856, he entered the Preobrajenki Regiment, he soon became very popular through his lovable character and his many accomplishments, both among his comrades and in social circles.

At this time he became acquainted with Dargomyszky, the greatest Russian composer of those days, whose fine personality and high ideals made a profound impression on the young man, and at whose house he met all the young composers of the day. Dargomyszky, mature alike in his work and years, had developed the theory in his new opera, "The Guest of the Stone," that the musical sound should be the exact translation of the spoken word. This was, of course, very much the same idea that Richard Wagner car-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ried out when in "Die Meistersinger" he let Eva and Magdalene, David and Hans Sachs, sing in vocal inflections conforming absolutely to the inflections of the speaking voice, a principle which, naturally, led to very different results when applied to the Russian language, so rich in sonority, so changeful in modulations. While Dargomyszky's "Guest of Stone" impresses one to-day as dry and theoretical, it was left to Moussorgsky, who eagerly absorbed Dargomyszky's axioms and instructions, to carry this idea of *musical naturalism* to its utmost convincing conclusions.

Moussorgsky now began to compose larger works, and in 1860 Anton Rubinstein conducted an orchestral Scherzo of his in St. Petersburg. Already the year before Moussorgsky had sent his resignation to the regiment, feeling that his musical calling needed his entire and undivided devotion. No advice from his family or his friends was of any avail; the examples of Cui and Lermontoff, the poet, that were held up to prove to him that art and service in the army could be combined, failed to impress him. He said, "I am not Lermontoff; I cannot serve two masters." This resolution was in one respect most dangerous to Moussorgsky, because, not being blessed with worldly means, he was deprived of an assured income and soon faced grave financial troubles. These sorrows, together with the strain of his feverish zeal in music, led very soon to a nervous breakdown, and he had to be removed to the country, where his mother had remarried after the death of his father. From now on for the rest of his life Moussorgsky's health was frail, his manners feverish, restless, irregular, and his sensitiveness high strung to a degree. In the mean time he worked on a grand opera on the subject of Flaubert's "Salammbo." This work was never finished, but a great many of its melodies have been rescued, being incorporated in "Boris Godounoff" and in the religious cantata "Joshua." In the white heat of his enthusiasm he scorned the advice of his friends to acquire a better knowledge of musical technique, because he mistakenly confounded technique with conventionalism and because he was too full of inspiration to wait for the years of dry preparatory work, and, further, because he believed that a new path can only be found by creating a new style together with a new inspiration.

The year 1865 forms a turning-point in his composing. His mother, Julia Ivanovna, had died, and in the days of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deepest emotion that sent his mind wandering back to the early days of his childhood he wrote his " Cradle Song of the Poor " and dedicated it to the memory of his mother. Here a new type of song is created; it is a picture of real life, a *genre* scene of the deepest meaning, this song of the peasant mother bent over the child, wailing and lamenting the doom to which it is predestined in the small and prescribed circuit of its life. From 1866 to 1868 Moussorgsky lives again in the country and comes once more in touch with the peasant population; and in the new light of the ideal that Dargomyszky inculcated in him, he sees a new beauty in the Russian peasant songs, in the simple and direct utterances of these village types. A little episode became of momentous interest in his life development: by chance he witnessed unseen from his window a scene where a poor little wretch, the village simpleton, makes love to the beautiful Ivanovna, the belle of the village. The touching and throbbing accents of this poor, loveless, feeble-minded creature, the direct truth that speaks out of his instinctive passion, made a profound impression on Moussorgsky.

And he tries to embody this little scene exactly as he has witnessed it in a song for which he wrote both words and music. This incident is used in " Boris Godounoff " most effectively, and because of its importance it is, perhaps, worth while to recall the fact that the Russian country people treat these unfortunate " yourodivy," the village simpletons, of which they have so many, with awe and superstitious reverence, believing that they have divine foresight, an idea that is to some extent borne out by science, which claims that their lack of intellect is often compensated by a keener intuition.

The witnessing of this pathetic little drama inspires him to a further resolution in his work. He will from now on not only seek to make the song an exact translation of the spoken word, but he will try to reveal through music those instinctive hidden undercurrents of emotion which lie beneath the veneer of civilization and which psychologists study in the insane and feeble-minded. He will thus, with his music, approach mysterious thresholds which among poets only Shakespeare dared to cross. The culmination of these efforts of Moussorgsky was to be the mad scene of " Boris Godounoff." But not everything in Moussorgsky's work deals with sad and gruesome things. He shares with some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the great men of Russian literature the reverse side of the national character—a keen sense of humor and mockery. A delightful specimen of this side of his talent is a character song called "The Seminarist," in which he shows the troubles of a young student of theology, who, under the watchful eyes of his teacher, the priest, essays a flirtation with the latter's daughter, is caught and drastically punished and now tries to repeat his Latin lesson of irregular verbs, while choked with sobs and haunted by vivid, unpleasant memories.

Even more amusing and original is another song called "The Peep Show," a kind of musical pamphlet in which he lets the five most important music critics of St. Petersburg pass by as in a *camera obscura,* each one parodied in a good-natured way. There is Famyntsine, the classic, for whom great music ends with Mozart. There is Fifi Tolstoi, who raves about Patti and dances an ecstatic waltz to the air of "Patti-Patti," and there is Zaremba prostrated before the genius of Wagner. This musical pamphlet, in its humor and *bonhomie,* was an immense success. What Moussorgsky would have done had he finished the music to Gogol's comedy, "The Marriage," we cannot tell. He completed but one act, in which he realized a verisimilitude in reproducing the types of the Russian *bourgeoisie,* faithful alike in manner of speech and of action, that strikes us today, forty-five years later, as extremely modern and really ahead of the times. But he gave up the work on this musical comedy when the idea of setting to music Pushkin's historical drama "Boris Godounoff" was proposed to him by the actor Nikolsky, whom he met at the house of his intimate friend Stassof at St. Petersburg. At Stassof's house he also met Rimsky-Korsakoff, with whom he liked to discuss music and with whom in later years he even shared an apartment.

In September, 1868, he started to work on "Boris." The first act was already finished in November, and in the fall of 1869 the first version was completed. He orchestrated it in the subsequent winter, and the circle of musicians that first heard it received it with great enthusiasm because it seemed to carry out the ideals of the young Russian school desiring absolute veracity and minute reproduction of life. His friends, though, unanimously objected to the absence of the female element and of a love story in the opera, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he remedied by inventing the scene of the Polish Princess Marina and by giving such subordinate personages as the hostess and the little Tsarevitch (played by a woman) several arias to sing. He had the good taste, though, to keep these arias in the folk-song style, thus preserving the unity of the opera's historical character.

In February, 1873, the second act was produced on a private stage, and owing to its success the entire work was taken up at the Imperial Theater, where the first performance took place on the 24th of January, 1874. It had an enormous success, especially with the younger generation, the progressive faction of the students. Twenty performances were given, but, much to the grief of the composer a great many scenes, because of court intrigue, were censored as revolutionary and had to be omitted. Just for a few weeks the life of the composer had seemed to reach a climax of recognition and success, but from now on one disappointment succeeded another. The only real gleam of hope that still shone into his life was a message of appreciation from Franz Liszt, who had received through mutual friends a set of children's songs called " The Child's Nursery " in which Moussorgsky had noted the little joys and troubles of child life with an accuracy and fidelity to detail hitherto unheard of. Liszt sent Moussorgsky word that he was enchanted with it and wanted to transcribe it for the piano.

During the last seven years of Moussorgsky's life he worked on another opera taken from Russian history and dealing with the conspiracy of the Khovanskis. Its Russian title is " Khovantchina." He did not live to complete this, although some parts of it were given under the direction of Balakireff during Moussorgsky's lifetime. The work was actually finished by Rimsky-Korsakoff, who also reorchestrated a great many parts of " Boris " to suit the exigencies of large opera-houses. The service that Rimsky-Korsakoff tried to render the memory of his comrade is of questionable value. Rimsky was not a big enough man to realize the beauty and originality of Moussorgsky's genius, and he often tried to cover and soften what seemed to him harshness, but what was really visionary audacity and the force of inspiration. His corrections, although giving higher color, often detracted from the vigor of Moussorgsky's drawing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Over the last few years of Moussorgsky's life it is well to pass quickly. The story is too sad. Deep melancholy had settled on him, and he was so poor that in order to make a living he had to take up inferior clerical work in the various ministerial departments and was obliged to accept a position as accompanist in a singing-school.

When he returned to St. Petersburg in 1880, he was already desperately ill and addicted to the use of cognac. His friends tried to raise money for him by giving a concert of his own compositions in February, 1881, but it was too late; and a few days later he had to be taken to the military hospital, where he died on the 16th of March, 1881.

The story of "Boris Godounoff" is founded on some facts in Russian history between the years 1598–1605. It is the story of the False Dimitri, used by many dramatists, among them the German, Schiller, and the Russian, Pushkin; and it is the text of the latter author which forms the basis of Moussorgsky's libretto, but certain scenes were written by Moussorgsky himself after descriptions by the historian, Karamzine. After the death of Ivan the Terrible, Feodor, the feeble-minded brother of the Tsar, had ascended the throne; and there being only an infant son, Dimitri, Boris, the brother-in-law of Feodor, was made regent and tutor of the child. Before the opening of the opera the gruesome deed had already taken place—that is, the murder of the Tsarevitch Dimitri in the church of Ouglitch at the hidden instigation of Boris, who knows that he thus paves for himself the way to the throne. Feodor meanwhile has died, and when the curtain rises the scene is the monastery of Novo-Dvejtchi near Moscow, whereto Boris has retired, professing that he will not accept the crown. A great crowd of country people, ignorant and docile, pour into the courtyard, driven by prefects and Boïars to implore Boris to become their Tsar. This blind multitude is a mere tool in the hands of the noblemen. The next scene shows the coronation of Boris on the Kremlin, where, though surrounded by the cheers of his subjects, the new Tsar, haunted by his deed, is sad and filled with ominous forebodings. This ends the prologue of the opera.

The first scene of Act I. reveals a cell in a monastery of Moscow at night. The venerable monk, Pimenn, is in the act of finishing his chronicle of the history of Russia, in which he has described the murder of the Tsarevitch Dimitri. A young novice, Gregory, who shares the cell, awakes from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obsessing dreams of ambition, and Pimenn, to quiet him tells him of the vanity of earthly power and how even those who wear the crown are not free from sorrow. While speaking of the murder of Dimitri the old monk mentions the fact that the Tsarevitch, had he lived, would have been exactly the same age as the young monk Gregory now is. Instantly an idea flares up in the mind of the fanatic novice; he persuades himself that he is God's instrument to bring just punishment upon Boris and to avenge the death of the Tsarevitch.

The second scene of the first act is at a village inn near the Lithuanian frontier, where the authorities are seeking the fugitive young monk, who is stirring up the people by proclaiming that he is the young Dimitri. They find Gregory in the company of two jolly vagabond friars, but he escapes through the window bound for the Polish frontier. The second act is in Polish Lithuania, where a great festival is being held at the Castle of Sandomir. Marina, a Polish princess, urged on by her Jesuit advisers, has received the false Dimitri hospitably, seeing in him a means to strike at the Russian throne. Dimitri, who has fallen in love with Marina, is stirred by her to his utmost ambition. She says that only when he becomes Tsar of Russia will she marry him. The next scene, in the palace of the Tsar Boris, in the nursery of the Imperial children, is an intimate picture of tender home life, offering opportunities for charming children songs and nursery ditties. Here the Tsar is seen in his human aspect as a grave and affectionate father capable of the deepest love for his children. Yet always the shadow of his crime moves beside him. He hears through the sly and cunning Boïar Chouisky, of an uprising at the frontier and of the appearance of a young man claiming to be Dimitri. Doubts arise in his soul as to whether his commands were actually carried out and if the Tsarevitch may not really still be alive. Left alone, a growing horror seizes him; the ghost of the murdered child seems to arise before his eyes—a vision he seeks in vain to repel—and with a prayer to God for forgiveness he sinks down fainting.

The next scene is the death of Boris. For reasons of operatic expediency the scene has been put at the end of the opera, a proceeding which is legitimate because the composer himself at one time had proposed the arrangement. In the great vaulted hall of the Kremlin the Duma of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Boïars is assembled to discuss the punishment of the usurper Dimitri. They have not caught him yet, but they are already planning what mode of death to choose. There they sit in solemn session in their sumptuous robes and furs when Boris, still in the throes of his terrible vision, appears, haggard and haunted. The old monk, Pimenn, enters, the chronicler of the first act, who, in the midst of intrigue and lying ambition, typifies Truth in this drama. He recounts to the Tsar a miracle of the restoring of sight to a blind peasant who made a pilgrimage to the grave of the dead Dimitri. While this proves the actual death of the Tsarevitch and the falsity of the pretender's claim, it only intensifies the mystic terror by which Boris is obsessed. He completely collapses under the clear gaze of the old monk, feeling that Pimenn reads the guilt in his soul. His attendants, seeing that his end is near, send for his little son to receive his benediction, and they then clothe Boris in the Imperial Skima, the funeral shroud of the Tsars. Boris dies.

The last scene, as Moussorgsky planned it, shows us the highway to Moscow on which on a bitter cold winter day the pretender is advancing with his troops toward the capital. A group of peasant serfs have caught an Imperial messenger and vent their rage upon him. Children are tormenting a poor feeble-minded lad, a "yourodivy," as they call them in Russia. The two vagabond friars of the scene in the inn again appear, seeking to rouse the people to revolt, with the result that a new storm of fury breaks out. In their frenzy they seize upon two Jesuits who are accompanying the victorious army of the false Dimitri (who is, in fact, the Jesuits' tool). While they are about to tear in pieces these monks the pretender appears riding at the head of his troops and proclaiming freedom and forgiveness to all. Equally frantic patriotism succeeds the outburst of fury, and cheering and shouting, the multitude joins the advancing army. Only the poor idiot boy remains behind, and while the snow falls more and more thickly he sits alone, sending forth his sorrowful plaint: "Fall, fall, bitter tears, weep, O soul of the righteous! The enemy approaches, blood will flow, fire will rage. Woe on Russia! Weep, ye starving people!"

In reviewing the life-work of Moussorgsky we find a variety of novel aspects that distinguish it, as well as a wide

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

range of themes that his work comprises; we find poignant pathos and delightful humor, strong dramatic contrasts on one side, and again, when needed, the monotony of an incessant invariable rhythm, the refined subtle charm of the children songs, and a barbaric stirring force in the folk scenes of his operas. With an extraordinarily precise vision he draws the musical pictures of a Russian landscape in the charm of spring and summer or in the grim clutches of Russia's frosty winter, and more in particular the picture of the Russian village in all the phases of peasant life, showing the mother and the child, the beggar and the "yourodivy," the young lovers, and the sad housewives, the Jews, and the monks. Such interior scenes as the pompous assembly of the peasant family at a holiday celebration, or the jollities of a village inn, are drawn by him with humor and precision.

Moussorgsky always needs a pictorial vision to inspire him to music; his understanding of musical truth means absolute adherence to life, absolute nature-likeness. This is decidedly a limitation of his talent, a one-sidedness that he shares with Berlioz and with Richard Strauss. He always has in view a goal not purely musical; the idea of thematic development, as it forms an intrinsic part of symphonic composition, never appeals to him. His strict adherence to the inflections of the Russian spoken word leads him to a liberty and freedom from regular rhythms hitherto unheard of. There is no regularity of musical periods corresponding to each other, as in the classical masters, and there are continual changes of bar and tempo such as nobody had dared to write up to his time. It means boldness, indeed, on the part of Moussorgsky in the year 1868, to change the bar twenty-three times inside of one song (No. 1 of the children songs); to-day we have become accustomed to such proceeding through the modernists of France and Germany; yet none of these followers have done it with so much logic as Moussorgsky, who merely sought after the most correct musical notation of the speech of the people. Modern musical explorers of Russia, who, like Madame Lineff, have traveled through the peasant districts, taking down the Russian folk songs by means of the phonograph, have stated scientifically how variable and flexible the character of the Russian folk melos is. We have become accustomed to the celebrated five-four rhythm of Tschaikowsky's "Pathétique," but by acquaintance with the work of Moussorgsky one learns

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

another typical Russian rhythm, the seven-four, and Rimsky's fairy opera entrances with its pompous and stately eleven-four that is as old as the oldest Slavonic traditions.

A new and fertile soil of exploration Moussorgsky had before him when with his keen ears and scrutinizing eyes he watched the country people at work and in song. He had caught as well the weird melodic outline of the Russian lament or wail, the strange incantations of those bards or "Rhapsodes" that now, as centuries ago, wander through the plains of Russia singing the old ballads and folk songs or lamenting at the funeral of the dead in long-drawn-out melodious phrases that are like the falling of tears. Moussorgsky's songs are the songs of the soil. His spirit of observation, of musical experimentation, let him describe the very graphic movements and gestures of the Moujik or Russian peasant in music, an achievement that helps the dramatic effectiveness of the folk scenes of his operas greatly. The idiom of the Russian folk song had so completely become his own that it is hard to say in his work where the nature product stops and where his own invention begins. Far from blaming him for relying thus upon the nation's resources, we ought to admire the truth and strength of his unconscious atavistic music heritage which allowed him to speak with the original force of the people, a spokesman of the dumb millions. Many other Russian composers have used the treasure hold of folk songs, but none like Moussorgsky without tainting and soiling them, without adding the smallness of individual taste to the pure gold of the people's own greatest possession.

This is exactly the corner where Moussorgsky grips us with his boundless love of truth and this is why his work, although strictly national in its idiom, reaches far over the Russian boundaries in its appeal to the entire civilized world. It is a singular power of music that it can convey the very soul essence of a nation even to those who have never come in any touch with it and who do not understand its language.

In "Boris Godounoff" the "people" are actually in the foreground of the happenings, the great masses are really the principal actor; at first dumb, oppressed, easily guided, then stirred up, threatening, finally in open revolt and jubilant war spirit. The strong veracity of these folk scenes can be likened without blasphemy to such eternal masterpieces as Shakespeare's "Coriolanus" and "Julius

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cæsar." And in all dramatic music there is nothing as near to "Macbeth" as the specter scene of "Boris."

One important innovation is that Moussorgsky uses principally prose diction instead of verse, which makes possible the intense realism of his style, and which permits him to faithfully picture scenes of every-day life. His acts begin without elaborate orchestral preludes, and the music ends with the falling of the curtain; in fact, his self-imposed restraint keeps him from drawing one more line or inventing one more melody than is actually demanded by the situation. The idea of spinning out or developing themes symbolically, as Wagner did, is entirely excluded from his operatic credo. On the contrary, it is to the singers, the actual exponents of the dramatic message, that supremacy is given. Much attention is paid to the acting not only of the soloists, but also of the chorus, and the gestures are often indicated by the music itself.

Since Wagner's death there is no work that has so stirred the musical world through its freedom from convention, its direct truth, and its compelling sincerity; and a singular pathos is attached to the fact that "Boris" was written forty-three years ago, but only came to the knowledge of the international public since the sumptuous performances in Paris in 1908. Since then the work has been given in Italian in both Monte Carlo and Milan, and is shortly to be heard in New York. This wider recognition of Moussorgsky's genius, which only began when his ideals struck fire from the susceptible musicians of France, has meant nothing less than a reawakening of musical conscience by this naturalist in art, who declared: "I want Truth above all! To seek and find these treasures hidden in the masses and in individuals which no hand as yet has touched, and to feed hungering humanity with them as with a wholesome food, this is the artist's problem and the joy of joys. Art is not a goal, but the means to talk to one's brethren!"

KURT SCHINDLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LIFE OF BENJAMIN DISRAELI*

VOLUME II

BY PRICE COLLIER

To those of us who knew Mr. Monypenny, the author of the two volumes of the *Life of Benjamin Disraeli* now in print, it is a sad business to chronicle the appearance of this second volume only a few days before the death of the author.

William Flavelle Monypenny was born in 1866 in the County Armagh in Ireland. He took his degree at Dublin University in 1888 after a brilliant career in mathematics, winning the gold medal of his year. He began journalism as a contributor to the *Spectator* and in 1899 became the editor of the *Johannesburg Star*. He went through the Boer War both with his pen and his sword, and the privations of the siege of Ladysmith laid the foundations for his untimely death. He resigned his editorship of the *Star* on the ground of fundamental political and economic differences with the proprietors of that paper and returned to England by way of East Africa and the Victoria Nyanza overland to Egypt. This was undoubtedly a further draught on his health that should not have been made.

On his return to England he was chosen for the task of writing Disraeli's life. He had barely seen this second volume through the press when he died. He was at one time assistant editor of the *Times*, and when the Times Publishing Company was formed in 1908 he was asked to join the Board. His career in journalism was almost as brilliant as that of Disraeli in politics. He was a stern soldier of duty

* *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli*, Vol. II., by William Monypenny. The Macmillan Company: London and New York, 1911.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was Monypenny, with little fear of public opinion and less fancy for the cajolery and courting of it. He was as little the Oriental as a man could well be, and the nice appreciation of the various episodes in Disraeli's life is the more notable since at heart this North of Ireland Protestant could have had little sympathy with certain sinuous methods of his hero.

I can fancy, however, that he came to have a sympathetic insight into Disraeli's life, because both Monypenny and Disraeli were desperate gamblers. The cool, steadfast Ulsterman staked his health on his country's side in war; staked his judgment and his reputation against the proprietors of the *Star* newspaper in South Africa; staked his lease of life against the herculean task of writing this biography when he was little more than an invalid; was always ready, in short, to play so long as the game was straight, the counters honest, and the stake a real and worthy one; and who shall say that he lost! Not I, at any rate. He did not finish his task. No real man ever does. But he was playing hard for his side when the darkness came, and, as I can personally testify, there was no whimpering and no murmur and no railing at the Great Umpire who sooner or later calls "Time!" for all of us.

It is this type of man who rules in India and in Egypt to-day to the wonderment of the superficial in other countries, who are surprised that the two races can be friends and even stout allies at a pinch.

Probably Disraeli would have understood Monypenny and seen his value just as quickly and comprehensively as Monypenny grew into an understanding of, and a sympathy for, Disraeli. They call it smooth patience, an elastic unwillingness to break, in the East; they call it dourness and doggedness in the West; but the qualities are sufficiently alike to braid well together when they meet. In the East they bow, in the West they bend stiffly before the blast, but the best of us, whether we are born to greet the sun's rising or to shade our eyes at its setting, neither curse nor cry.

In my review of the first volume of the *Life of Disraeli*, in the February number of The North American Review for 1911, Disraeli's career is carried on into the year 1837, when at the age of thirty-three he had just won his seat in Parliament.

The fop, the novelist, the Jew, who came from no public

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

school or university, who pretended that he did not even know how to throw a ball, dowered with neither land nor name, had fought his way into what in those days was the "best club in London," the House of Commons. The men who thought it the best club in London then would consider it scarcely more exclusive than the Charing Cross Railway Station now. It was the first Parliament of Queen Victoria which assembled on November 15, 1837, in which Disraeli took his seat for the first time as a House of Commons man. On August 27, 1839, Parliament was prorogued, and the next day Disraeli was married to Mrs. Wyndham Lewis at St. George's, Hanover Square. She was forty-five, the widow of his fellow-member, a dozen years older than her husband, with an income of some twenty thousand dollars a year, and a house in London. She used to say, laughingly: "Dizzy married me for my money, but if he had the chance again he would marry me for love."

It is a dictum of Bacon: "Certainly wife and children are a kind of discipline of humanity," but for most men it is a wholesome discipline; and in the case of Disraeli for more than a quarter of a century his married life was of the happiest.

He was still deeply in debt, his first speech in the House had been an humiliating failure, he was widely distrusted, but with a buoyancy, an unimpaired vanity, an unwearying patience, and a confidence in himself which seemed to well from an inexhaustible source.

"I got away by 9.30 and went down to the House, which I found dozing in committee, but I made a speech. . . . It made great effect. . . . The complete command of the House I now have is remarkable."

"The affair last night realized all my hopes; the success was complete and brilliant." [Of another speech.]

He quotes in a letter to his wife the following anent his new novel *Coningsby:*

"I have seen Hope; he only says he is enchanted, but will say nothing more till he has finished and taken in the whole. Cochrane raving; Manners full of wild rapture."

Few men are so easily buoyed up by flattery. To most men of our race it comes as a sort of douche, as something feminine that has been given us by mistake, as though we had found a curling-iron instead of a razor on the dressing-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

table. Serious men are humiliated by it if it is trivial, and made to feel gravely responsible if it is sincere.

If anybody had said in 1824, that the bejeweled and perfumed young cub Disraeli would make his way into Parliament there would have been a chorus of laughter; if in 1837, now that he was in Parliament, any one had said that this Jew, with a love-lock across his forehead, would down Sir Robert Peel in less than ten years, words fail me to describe the odds that would have been offered against such a result; as for dreaming that he would end his career as the leader of the country gentlemen, the hunting squires, and the aristocracy of England, there are no such dreams, there would have been only caricature to describe such a thing.

But it all happened. Let us ask ourselves why. The greatest of all revolutions of modern times was taking place in England, as during the last thirty years it has taken place in Germany. England was changing from an agricultural to an industrial nation. The men who had ruled England were the landed gentry; dull, if you please, but dutiful and largely deserving their tenure of power by their efficiency and by their sane and pleasant relations with the people who worked for them. With industrialism came two changes: one the rise of the rich manufacturers demanding representation and some power, and the other the new relation between a stock company or a soulless corporation and its wage-earners. The personal element between employer and employed was evaporating and with nothing to take its place. Ancient slavery and modern slavery differ only in that the modern slave can change his master. Democracy is, naturally enough, startled to find that slavery persists in existing, despite all forms of legislation for its disappearance.

At this same time a school of economists arose who offered as one sedative to the worker, free trade. This was to cheapen his necessities of life, and as England had become so largely industrial she was—it has turned out to be true—to be driven headlong to the destruction of her agriculture by the removal of the taxes on corn. The power of the landed gentry is now no more. Monypenny writes of Sir Robert Peel; "Peel was a typical Englishman of the middle classes from which he sprang, with their practical concrete intellect and a certain scorn and incapacity for theoretical principles; and theory had her revenge by mas-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tering him periodically." If this was true of Peel, it was even more truly characteristic of the great majority of the rest of the House of Commons.

Disraeli was of those who know that life is the language, books only the dictionaries, men are the text, and books only the marginal notes; but he knew too that one remains sadly provincial in his study of men unless he supplements his intercourse with them by a profound study of the dictionaries and the marginal notes. He had the patience, the intellectual tenacity, and the temperament to do this. His outdoor-loving contemporaries became congested with much study and an idea made them feverish. Such Englishmen as that are not uncommon to-day. Disraeli supplied what they lacked. He was fluent and imperturbable in speech once he found himself; he knew how to get up his subject, he was fearless, and he offered the then new panacea of a Tory democracy or a union of the aristocracy and the laborer to overcome the dull, unimaginative legislation of the middle-class economists of whom Peel had become the champion. It was a fine duel and took place in the House of Commons between 1837 and 1846, when Peel was beaten, resigned, and disappeared as a factor in political life.

The first volume of the *Life* describes Disraeli's duel with British prejudice or phlegm, phrase it as you will, and his election to Parliament; this second volume describes his duel with those same qualities impersonated in Sir Robert Peel and is even more exciting than the first, and the curtain goes down again, as it did on the first volume, when one's mouth is watering for more.

This Oriental, with a considerable acquaintance with the men of his time, not a little experience as a traveler, and with much more ability as a student of the theoretical side of contemporary questions than most other men in the House of Commons, took part in the beginning of the greatest and most momentous change that has taken place in English politics. England had been governed by outdoor men, country squires, with wide practical experience of domestic problems, and she was soon to slide from that dominion into the grasp of tired lawyers legislating instead of governing.

Industrialism packs people together, with that herding comes a vast increase in the rules and laws and by-laws of the game, and with that comes a corps of professional

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legalists to settle disputes and to interpret the meaning of the countless new laws. We legislate now, we do not govern. Legislating in order to retain office or legislating in order to regain office is not governing. That is the great change that has taken place in our national assemblies since Disraeli's day. Had Disraeli lived he would have been astounded to see how completely in these days government by tired lawyers has taken the place of government by hearty country squires in every democracy in the world. We are no longer governed by men of leisure, but by men in haste; no longer by amateurs who look upon it as a duty, but by professionals who make a living out of it. "The wisdom of a learned man cometh by opportunity of leisure and he that hath little business shall become wise. How can he get wisdom that holdeth the plow and that glorieth in the goad, that driveth oxen, and is occupied in their labors and whose talk is of bullocks?" We are now governed, not as many people think by the people, but by interpreters of the mesh of legislation in which more and more we entangle ourselves; and, strange to say, we strike against and disobey, and dislike the fatigued and fatiguing legal pedants more than we ever did the dull but common-sense tyrant who solved the problems of government out of the experience born of actual intercourse with the people and out of actual personal participation in their troubles as neighbors and friends. Government was then based upon a compact, now it is based upon a theory; it was then a series of common-sense compromises; it is now a series of legislative interpretations.

Disraeli's dream was that the industrial would fall back again upon the honest country squirearchical aristocracy and depend upon such men as the agriculturist had done. Speaking to his constituents at Shrewsbury, he said:

> "If there were any relics of the feudal system remaining, he regretted that there were not more. What was the fundamental principle of that system? That the tenure of all property should be the performance of its duties—'the noblest principle that was ever conceived by sage or ever practised by patriot.'"

The inarticulate squires, dumfounded at what they deemed the treachery of Peel, who had gone over to the side of the free-traders, turned to Disraeli at last, not with pleasure, not altogether with confidence, but in despair. He at least could articulate; an idea did not send up his tempera-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ture; to work indoors with his head did not make him apoplectic; and the bewildering political tergiversations of Peel did not leave him spluttering incoherent expletives. He was the man of the hour in consequence. To the English squire he was not an ideal champion, but he looked to be salvation, and they grasped at him and eventually robed him in ermine, put an earl's coronet on his head, and a Jew novelist who could not play cricket or put a horse at a fence became Prime Minister.

It is better than any novel, this *Life of Disraeli,* and to the American particularly the scenery, the action, the problems, and the political changes pictured in this second volume are of peculiar interest as bearing upon the development of our own political history. A pessimist may even be led to suspect from a perusal of these volumes that what we take to be progression is only circumgression, after all.

PRICE COLLIER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE OHIO CONSTITUTION

A REPLY AND A REJOINDER

To the Editor of the North American Review:

SIR,—An article appearing in your November issue under the title "Socialism in the Ohio Constitution," by Daniel J. Ryan, appears to one acquainted with the facts to call for an answer. The writer of the above article has given the impression that the new constitution of Ohio was fathered by fanatics and obtained by fraud. Some facts pointing to the absurdity and falsity of his idea should be brought before your readers.

Long before discussion became timely advocates of amendments to our State constitution were found not only among so-called progressives or radicals, but among reactionaries. The Ohio State Board of Commerce, an avowedly conservative organization, through its Journal and through the public speeches of its president, Allen Ripley Foote, was crying as loudly as any for a convention to amend the constitution. To be sure, their particular hobby was taxation, and they were later found vigorously opposing the amendments finally submitted; but they as well as others demanded this convention. A perusal of the Ohio State *Journal of Commerce* for the year 1910 will furnish sufficient answer to Mr. Ryan's statement that the only ones who were asking for a constitutional convention were "labor leaders, Socialists, single-taxers, and other reformers."

The trouble with the writer seems to be that he doesn't like the amendments which the convention finally presented and which were adopted by the people; in this he does not stand alone. Any argument which he might make against the advisability or soundness of certain amendments which were adopted would be timely and acceptable. He confuses, however, the argument as to the general desirability of the amendments with the argument as to whether or not they were desired by the people of the State of Ohio. The two questions are entirely distinct. In arguing against the amendments he makes two statements which are part of an argument to the second point above mentioned—*i. e.*, as to whether these amendments were desired by the people of Ohio. The two statements are, in substance, that the delegates to the convention and the vote on the amendments submitted were misrepresentative of the electorate of Ohio!

"That the majority vote on the convention was an involuntary and enforced one is evidenced by the result of the election of the delegates to that body. At this election, held in 1911, less than twenty-five per cent. of the electors of the State participated; and not a single delegate received a vote of a majority of the electors of the county from which he was elected." "Any one securing the required number of names could become a candidate. This opened the door to all kinds of men; it practically closed it to those of great fitness and ability." "The result was a mediocre, unorganized, and chaotic mass."

As an answer to this I give briefly the history of the election of candidates to this convention from my own county (Hamilton). A temporary organization was effected for the sole purpose of electing representative men to the constitutional convention. It was made up of delegates from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

almost every civic, social, and business organization in the city, and was known as the United Constitution Committee. This body, after a thorough discussion of what should go into a new constitution, pledged itself to four amendments only and named nine men as its ticket in Hamilton County. Of these, three were labor-union men, all able and highly respected. One of these men was elected to the State Legislature on November 5th, largely because of satisfaction with his record in the Constitutional Convention. One was a business man of standing—secretary of the Receivers' and Shippers' Association of Cincinnati. One was a young lawyer, an independent in city politics, of sterling character and marked ability—then and now president of the Federated Improvement Association, the central body of all the local civic leagues in the city. Another was a lawyer of prominence who was seriously talked of at that very time for Mayor of Cincinnati, and who has since been elected to Congress from the First District of Ohio. Another was one of the ablest business men in the city, a man of wealth and social standing, for many years past holding the important position of president of the Board of Sinking Fund Trustees of Cincinnati. Another was an ex-judge, highly regarded throughout the State as a jurist, and a member of one of the most successful law firms in the city. The ninth was Herbert Bigelow. It would be impossible to secure a more representative set of men. The result was that, although there were over forty candidates in the field, these nine men with one exception were elected by large pluralities. There could not have been a more just or more practical method for selecting these delegates. Every legitimate interest in the community was represented. The experience of Hamilton County was the experience of the entire State. Mr. Ryan's description is not accurate.

The delegates certainly were representative. Was the vote on the amendments also representative? It is not an answer to this question to say that only a certain percentage of the electors voted. There are many reasons familiar to any student of politics for a small vote on questions of this nature. The question is, Did those who voted vote as the mass would have voted? Was the relation between those who voted for and those who voted against certain amendments expressive of the general division of opinion thereon? In short, did the result express the wishes of a majority of the people of Ohio?

The general tone of the convention and of the amendments submitted was undeniably progressive and radical. If these amendments voiced the will of the people of Ohio, then the people of Ohio are progressive and radical. Any question as to the accuracy of this description is easily answered by a survey of contemporary political events. In the spring primaries, where the lines were drawn between Conservative and Radical in both the leading political parties, Mr. Taft, a native son, but supposedly a reactionary, was overwhelmingly defeated by Roosevelt throughout the entire State; and Mr. Wilson as a Progressive on the Democratic side, although he did not enter the State once during the primary campaign, took eighteen national delegates from Judson Harmon, another native son, and a man who had made an excellent record as Governor. Since the election on the constitutional amendments James Cox, at the regular election, running unqualifiedly as a progressive and insisting on the enactment of all legislation necessary to put the constitutional amend-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments into effect, was elected by the largest plurality ever given a Democratic Governor in the State of Ohio. An impartial survey of the events of the last twelve months in Ohio can leave no doubt as to the sentiment of the people of this State; they are unmistakably and determinedly progressive.

In a general way the result was expressive of the will of the majority. Was it also correctly registered on the particular amendments? Eight of the amendments failed of passage by margins ranging from 1,079 to 87,455. These amendments cannot be in any way classified, nor can any reason be given for their failure to pass except that the voters so willed it. Those failing of adoption included the abolition of capital punishment; one dealing with contempt proceedings and injunctions; woman's suffrage; one designated to eliminate a useless race distinction by striking out the word "white"; and one providing for a fifty-million bond issue for roads. Those amendments which carried had margins which varied from 4,669 to 220,584. Among those receiving large majorities were: one taking off the limit for damages in case of wrongful death, 160,387; one providing for investigations by the General Assembly, 173,442; one providing for the welfare of employees, 163,860; registering and warranting of land titles, 174,566; primary elections, 166,689; double liability of bank stockholders, 220,584; State-wide civil service, 102,187. An analysis of this vote, a survey of those amendments which carried and those which did not, and an examination of the widely different pluralities which the various amendments received show deliberate thought and accurate discrimination.

On a trip through the State during the week preceding the election I had an opportunity to question hundreds of voters from all sections of the State. I was surprised at the interest they were taking and the fullness of their information on particular amendments. My thorough questioning at that time led me to an opinion which the results have strengthened, that the voters were to a remarkable degree exercising a sober judgment after thorough investigation and discussion. I believe that the voters of this State on September 3d last got exactly what they wanted.

It is evident from a thorough investigation of the personnel of the convention and of the votes on the various amendments that they were both representative of the citizens of Ohio. Whatever may be said as to the merits of the amendments finally adopted, there can be no question but that the discriminating will of the majority prevailed. With that fact established, under our present system of government all cavil and complaint should cease. The only course of action aside from acquiescence should be an attempt to change the will of the majority.

Which brings us to a brief discussion of the merits of the amendments themselves. Mr. Ryan says that "the amendments submitted ranged in merit from the unnecessary and harmless to the vicious and revolutionary." Within that range there would seem to be no room for anything practical or beneficial.

Many amendments were submitted to the convention—a total of three hundred and fifty in all. Out of this hopper came forty-two propositions for submission to the voters. Of these one provided as to when the amendments should take effect, another provided a new method of amend-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the constitution, another provided for eliminating the word "white" where Amendment Fifteen to the Constitution of the United States had already rendered it nugatory, another provided for suits against the State, and another abolished the Board of Public Works. Besides these there were amendments which were calculated to meet former specific judicial objections on the ground of unconstitutionality, such as the one guaranteeing land titles, the one permitting the use of voting-machines, and the one providing for the organization of boards of education. There was also a group of amendments known as "the labor amendments," which provided for abolishing prison contract labor, for a compulsory Workmen's Compensation Act, for an eight-hour day on public works, for the elimination of the injunction in labor disputes, and for a minimum wage. Another group had to do with changes in courts and court procedure—changing jurisdiction, creating new courts, and introducing the three-fourths jury rule. In addition, there were amendments standing alone which aimed to provide for State-wide civil service, a State liquor license, direct primaries for all elective offices, woman's suffrage, a fifty-million-dollar bond issue for roads, abolition of capital punishment, municipal home-rule, inheritance, income and franchise taxes, and the initiative and referendum. The mere recital of these proposals shows their scope and importance. Among the total of forty-two there were, undoubtedly, some of small merit and relative triviality. On the whole, however, the proposals covered thoroughly the burning questions of the day in Ohio.

The initiative and referendum proposal, which Mr. Ryan referred to as distinctly Socialistic and as "more radical and misrepresentative in its operation than the similar measure in any other State in the Union," was not as radical as its advocates desired and was the result of a compromise. It does not provide for the direct initiative. Under its provisions a measure can only get before the people by being presented first to the legislature by petition signed by three per cent. of the electors of the State distributed over half of the counties of the State. If the legislature takes no action on this law, then by filing a petition of an additional three per cent. of the electors the measure can be placed upon the ballot at the next regular election. No special election under this amendment can be held, thus avoiding one of the stock arguments against the initiative and referendum. The provision that the names on the petition must be distributed throughout half the counties in the State prevents a purely local measure from coming up for the vote of the entire electorate. There are adequate safeguards for guaranteeing the genuineness of signatures and means set forth for acquainting the voters with the proposal to be voted upon.

The referendum part of the amendment provides for a referendum upon the petition of six per cent. of the voters, distributed over half the counties in the State, within ninety days after the adjournment of the legislature. When the writer makes such statements as "Its advocates were unwilling to leave any power to the General Assembly," "They did not propose to take any chances on public sentiment changing," "The principle of legislation by the crowd is thus securely sealed," and "Ohio has distinguished herself by making this percentage the smallest yet adopted by any State," it is evident that he is speaking through a mist

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of prejudice so thick that it is impossible to tell whether the voice comes from ignorance or a wilful desire to pervert the facts.

In paying his respects to the amendment dealing with welfare of employees, the writer says that "as a specimen of vicious and discriminating organic law this has no parallel in the constitutions of civilized States." If these words mean anything, and if I am able to decipher their meaning, I would refer Mr. Ryan to the last clause of Article V. of the Constitution of the United States.

It has seemed to me that the things which I have said in this letter should be said and said to your readers in justice to the people of Ohio. We have not been captured either by pirates or fanatics, but are learning, as the citizens of other States are learning, that our forebears did not perform a vicarious act of legislation for all generations to come when they framed our organic law sixty years ago. I am, sir,

CHARLES SAWYER.

To the Editor of the North American Review:

SIR,—I have read with care Mr. Sawyer's communication criticizing my article on "Socialism in the Ohio Constitution," and I do not see any reason to modify any statement or conclusion contained therein. I am compelled, however, to dissent strongly to the arguments set forth in his reply.

Briefly stated, he controverts my arguments that both the Constitutional Convention and the adoption of the amendments were misrepresentative of the real wishes of the majority of the people of Ohio; he contends that the results of the elections for constitutional delegates and on the amendments were expressive of the sentiments of the Ohio electorate. He rests his demonstration on this—that the conservative element of the State desired both the Constitutional Convention and the amendments offered, because the Ohio State Board of Commerce was an ardent advocate of a revision of the Constitution. "To be sure," he says, "their particular hobby was taxation." He also argues that the high character of the Hamilton County delegation in the convention is evidence that the general electorate desired a constitutional revision. He further argues that because Governor-elect James M. Cox aggressively advocated all the amendments, especially the initiative and referendum, and was elected by an overwhelming plurality, that this was evidence that the sentiment of Ohio favored direct legislation.

The conclusions and statements set forth in the balance of his communication are largely due to a failure to carefully read my article.

I repeat that the criticisms of Mr. Sawyer do not answer my conclusions that the actively organized forces in the election of the Constitutional Convention and the adoption of the radical amendments were "labor leaders, Socialists, single-taxers, and other reformers," including in the last class those whose hobby was taxation. Indeed, the controlling factors back of both elections were those with hobbies.

As to his argument that because Governor-elect Cox received such a pronounced plurality it is to be inferred that his election represents an approval of the initiative and referendum and other radical amendments, an examination of the facts will lead to a different conclusion. Governor Cox's election was due primarily to the utter demoralization and division of the Republican party in Ohio. Another important factor was his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brilliant and courageous canvass in which he outlined his policies, which by their affirmative and philanthropic nature won the commendation of a great many voters. Another powerful vote-making element in his canvass was his positive support of the license of the liquor traffic. His advocacy of the radical amendments had but little material effect on his election; and the vote for Mr. Cox cannot by any sort of reasoning be taken as an approval of the initiative and referendum. Many of the counties—to be accurate, thirty-six of the sixty-nine—which he carried gave pronounced majorities against the initiative and referendum. These thirty-six counties gave Mr. Cox a plurality of 47,532; at the election two months before they gave a majority of 41,341 against the initiative and referendum. What justifies the conclusion that Mr. Cox's plurality was due to his advocacy of the initiative and referendum? On the contrary, a strong disapproval of the amendments in more than half of the counties carried by the Governor-elect makes it very evident that the conclusion of Mr. Sawyer is fallacious.

By the adoption of the two radical amendments discussed in my article —the initiative and referendum, and the welfare of employees — are changed the very fundamentals of our State government. They destroy the representative character of the General Assembly and sweep away the protective guarantees for personal and property rights in Ohio. Mr. Sawyer himself recognizes that the only protection left against an unreasonable operation of the last-mentioned amendment is the Federal Constitution. Why or wherefore the vast majority of the people of Ohio permitted this to be done is not worthy of discussion now. But it is the merest absurdity to contend that it is the action of the electorate of this State when only half as many of the electors voted at the constitutional election as did at the State election in November. It was emphatically a triumph of the minority by which 346,373 out of 1,200,000 voters fastened direct legislation on the majority and swept away the constitutional guarantees, in certain cases, of every man, woman, and child in Ohio. When we consider that the population of Ohio is nearly five million, this change in our fundamental law to affect every one of them is brought about by less than one-fourteenth of the inhabitants.

More than ever I am of the opinion that these radical amendments are misrepresentative of the aggregate public sentiment in Ohio and was not desired by our people. The occurrence of daily events shows the folly and danger of the step taken. Petitions for initiative laws are already filed with the Secretary of State to be acted upon by the General Assembly. Many of the thousands of names were secured by employed agents at five cents per name. Every student of the popular mind knows with what facility names can be secured to petitions. Their unreasonableness, injustice, and absurdity seem to be no bar to their success. One of the initiative bills to be presented to the legislature provides practically for the suppression of a free press and State censorship of newspapers. It grows out of the supposed grievance of some people against certain editors. Yet these petitions receive thousands of signatures. The law, if passed by the General Assembly, would be as tyrannical a piece of legislation as any decree issued by Napoleon against the newspapers of France during the First Consulate.

I am, sir,

DANIEL J. RYAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

ALGERNON CHARLES SWINBURNE. By EDWARD THOMAS. New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1912.

ONE necessarily feels distrustful twinges in reading a book of criticism so hastily written that it falls short of being grammatical. One may question certain of Arnold's critical verdicts, those upon Shelley in particular; but at least Arnold learned to write English before he wrote. This task Mr. Edward Thomas evidently felt was superfluous. There are many writers who do not know what belongs in a paragraph, but the average writer learns what belongs in a sentence. Mr. Thomas has no prejudices as to the amount of straggling matter to be contained within a period. He is capable of including in one sentence the following conglomerate mass: "The young versifier and lover of poetry was not to be discouraged by a schoolmaster, he was more likely to be impressed by his first meeting with a poet in his early school-days, for though the poet was only Rogers he showed 'gracious and cordial kindness' to the small Etonian." There is no possible relation, even that of contrast, between the schoolmaster who corrected meter and the poet who showed kindness. In like manner Mr. Thomas sets down such a combination as this: "Tennyson did not come to the Isle of Wight until 1853, but Swinburne preferred to think and certainly to write about Northumberland." Why Tennyson's coming in 1853 had anything to do with Swinburne's thinking about Northumberland is unstated. Again, Mr. Thomas writes, "He was to recall how often he had chanted or shouted or otherwise declaimed Hugo's Gastibelza on horseback." There is nothing but the small "h" for horseback to save one from fancying the poem entitled "Gastibelza on Horseback."

The construction of the book is as loose as the sentence structure, and it is quite evident that in writing of the personal characteristics of his subject the author failed to consult authoritative sources. He repeats Edmund Gosse's statement that Swinburne required almost no sleep, dozing occasionally as he sat upright on the deep sofa of his sitting-room. Mr. Watts-Dunton, however, who lived with Swinburne the last thirty years of his life, totally denies this legend, asserting that the poet habitually slept eight or nine hours every night and always took a nap after his luncheon. This may not seem a very vital matter, except in so far as it might influence young poets to imagine genius independent of rest and as the truth on any and every subject is important *per se.*

In the chapter on the prose works he fails to say one word of Swin-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

burne's unsurpassed power of invective and his marvelous command of irony. There are few passages in the history of English prose to compare in delicate and insidious irony with the one in "L'Année Terrible," where Swinburne speaks of the poet who harkens rather to the voice of expediency and interest than to the higher voices: "To the friendly admonition that truth which is overtrue is all but falsehood; that in seeking the ideal you find the visionary and become a dreamer through being too much a thinker; . . . that too much light is as sure to blind you as too much darkness, and, if necessary, you should not open the shutter more than half-way; that war and the scaffold are detestable in theory and practically unserviceable; but the shop must be set up beside the temple, though the money-changers were once on a time driven out of it, for the fault of Jesus was to be something too much of a God; that in all things wisdom is moderation, and from its quiet corner can remark and reprehend the flaws and excesses of the universe; as, for instance, that though the sun be splendid and the spring be sweet, the one has too many beams and the other too many roses. This is the inconvenience of all things of the kind and God is by no means free from exaggeration; to imitate Him is to fall into perfection—a grave risk. What is the use of being inaccessible? Jesus goes too far in declining to take the offer of Beelzebub into consideration. Not that I say He ought to close with it, but it is stupid of God to be rude when the devil is civil; it would have been better to say, 'I'll think it over, my good friend.'"

For three full pages of the *Essays and Studies* Swinburne gives an example of subtle irony on the matter of compromise which is unmatched in the English language.

Mr. Thomas accuses Swinburne of self-contradiction because at different times in his life and under different provocation he points out different sides of the genius of Byron and of Whitman. If it is self-contradiction to say of a man one day that he wears a white shirt and of the same man the next day that he wears black trousers, then Swinburne contradicted himself; otherwise not. For all Whitman's freedom and love of liberty, Swinburne loved and admired him; but when he was proclaimed by the popular voice to be a poet equal to Shelley, then Swinburne pointed out differences and degrees of excellence.

It may seem from this that Mr. Edward Thomas holds no brief for the poet he has chosen to write about, maintaining toward him throughout an attitude of marked moderation. No one reading his book would realize that its subject was undoubtedly one of the two greatest of the later Victorians, and certainly one of the two whose message is authoritative for the present generation. On the other hand, Mr. Thomas seems to have read his poet punctiliously and patiently, if not appreciatively, from end to end. It is not his fault if he did not and could not mark its rare and, in many directions, unexcelled beauties. In speaking of Swinburne's use of echoes, he fails to put in the most beautiful ever written; the lines from "Félise,"

> "Ah, that such sweet things should be fleet,
> Such fleet things sweet."

The book has the merit of being a thorough and patient study of the complete works. Swinburne's exuberant facility with rhyme and rhythms is pointed out, as is his unmatched wealth of diction. A strong plea is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made, however, for greater parsimony in using the materials of poetry, lest the reader's attention should flag. The chief flaw in the book is that a young man unpoetic by nature and unable to write correct sentences is finding fault with a poet who could at any odd moment build a very tower of Babylon out of words, whose ease and facility and wealth were overwhelming to the average mind. The study, therefore, while careful and well intentioned, fails in any wise to lead its readers to one of the greatest minds of our era; and the great book upon the life, the personality, the genius of Swinburne is still unwritten. Who is to write it?

THE LYRIC YEAR. Edited by FERDINAND EARLE. New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1912.

Advertisement proclaimed somewhat over a year ago that some one wished to invest one thousand dollars in prizes for good verse. All the singers in the land were invited to compete for the three prizes into which the sum was to be divided. The result was that ten thousand poems were sent in by two thousand writers, and these were examined by Mr. Ferdinand Earle, and the one hundred which form the present volume were chosen as the best. Of these one hundred, three were again chosen by the editor and Mr. Edward J. Wheeler and Mr. Stanley Braithwaite to receive the prizes.

It may be gross ignorance to confess that we do not know the qualifications of the first and last judges named here; yet we find many others who do not know the names, and *Who's Who,* that compendium of universal information, fails to enlighten us. Mr. Edward J. Wheeler has for years chosen out the most commonplace and unmusical of verse from the current magazines to reprint in *Current Literature.*

There are two American poets of reputation who are well known as understanding of what materials and in what manner verse should be made. Had either one been on the board of judges, the book must have commanded serious respect. As it is, one simply wonders on what grounds these three men decided that they could give verdict on American poetry. Had Louise Imogen Guiney, poet, critic, artist, and great craftsman, given a verdict we should have taken note; or had Georgiana Goddard King, who gives courses in the technique of verse-making at Bryn Mawr College, been one of the judges, the results would have had significance.

It is noteworthy that the *Lyric Year* contains neither of these preeminent names—names that command respect wherever the English tongue is spoken. A poem like Miss Guiney's "The Kings," or a lyric like Miss King's "A man called Dante I have heard," would have shed glamour over the entire volume. As it is, the *Lyric Year* is not a volume upon which to congratulate ourselves. We profoundly trust that it represents neither more nor less than the taste of three men. Most of the material therein is pretty sorry stuff. The editor in the Introduction writes that he "has endeavored to give preference to poems fired with the time spirit . . . rather than to mere technical performance." Probably no greater mistake of judgment could be made in testing poetry, which just in so far as it *is* poetry throws off the "time spirit" and becomes universal and immortal. By such a rule of measurement as he suggests we should forget Swinburne's "Tristram of Lyonesse" to read the Jubilee

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poem of 1887, or discard Shelley's "Sensitive Plant" and "The West Wind" for the denunciation of the Lord Chancellor. The entire principle is as wrong and as destructive of real poetry as anything could possibly be.

Of the poems contained in this volume we should certainly not have given a prize to any, but we should have given without question the highest mark to Florence Earle Coates's "New York." Thirty-nine women, sixty men, and one little child are represented in the book. The last mentioned was, doubtless, included for entirely personal reasons; but to do so is to make any wise person tremble for the child's welfare, no less than to detract from the dignity and significance of the volume.

Of the well-known names contained in the book, Bliss Carman's is perhaps the best known. His contribution, however, is far from being up to his average. An unpardonable line is, "Luring civilization on to the fair and new." "Make us a heaven by hand" and "The uplift of the heart" are shocking solecisms and would in the eye of any real knowledge of poetry have thrown the poem out altogether.

Grace Hazard Conkling ruins her quite charming verses with such rasping words as "zoned" and "glimpsed," the last being, perhaps, the most unpardonable vulgarism in the English language and a word rejected in the roughest and readiest conversation of the well-bred and educated. Indeed, throughout the volume it is quite evident that the editors were totally oblivious to matters of metrical technique and choice diction.

Florence Brooks contributes a poem of ten stanzas in quatrain form with but a single rhyme for each quatrain, and uses the harsh and unmusical word "mechanized" in the first line. Donn Byrne has an experiment in the magic rhythm of "Innesfree," a rhythm rarely used and difficult, but gracefully handled by Stevenson in "I will make you brooches and toys for your delight," and by Miss King in "Something calls and whispers along the city street." Mr. Byrne closes one stanza with the three booming spondees which are so skilfully handled in "Innisfree." The difficulty is that Mr. Byrne can only use them once, and his other stanzas fall short of the correct meter. Miss Constance Lounsbury contributes some fair Sapphics; Mr. Hermann Donner tells of the "hell he glimpsed"; Frances Gregg writes after the manner of Laurence Hope; Hermann Hagedorn gives the poorest lyric we have ever seen from his pen; Joyce Kilmer has a rather slight and humorous bit of portraiture after the manner of Edward S. Martin's verse; Hermann Kittridge imitates Poe very badly; Agnes Lee publishes a poem on Browning which is a complete failure, and Theodore Eugene Oertel imitates Poe even worse than Mr. Kittridge. Mrs. Peabody's contribution reminds one of Morris's "Blue Closet"; Sara Teasdale has a singable little lyric called "I Shall Not Care," which is charming despite the remininscence of Christina Rossetti's "When I am Dead, My Dearest."

The book is a disappointment. To measure its value by any real poetry is futile. What is here collected is current magazine verse not of the best order. Using the little Oxford volume of 1880, *Love in Idleness,* as a touchstone, one may see how dull and imitative—and worse, commonplace—is the tone of this little volume.

It may be, of course, that a better volume of verse could have been made of the material to hand, and the failure as like as not lies with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the editors rather than the contributors, since only one hundred out of ten thousand poems are here published.

HAIL AND FAREWELL. By GEORGE MOORE. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1912.

If not admirable, George Moore is highly amusing. He went to Ireland in response to a vision he had commanding him to help with the Celtic revival, and recounted his experiences in the trilogy of confessions called *Ave, Salve, Vale.* The present volume is the second in the series, and more delightfully funny than the first.

All his life George Moore has given himself in the intervals of his novels to the task of self-confession. He has the very style, disconnected, witty, intimate, which makes such matter readable. He went to Ireland somewhat expectant that so important an arrival would be met with a brass-band and proper festivities. But Ireland was busy about its own affairs and had had no rumors that he was a great prophet. When he offered in pure charity a contribution to the Gaelic magazine, he was editorially told that if he would sign it and leave it it would be considered in due course.

Yeats and "the folds of his style" Moore treats to delightful irony. Dear Edward Martyn and his soul figure again and seem more amusing than ever. Æ, of whom no one, apparently, can speak an unkind word, is the only friend who escapes Moore's scathing satire. Æ, with his immortal soul and imperturbable serenity, invites no enmity. A large part of the volume is given over to Moore's discovery that the Roman Catholic religion is incompatible with literature. This startling discovery and his own conversion to the Anglican Church and his proposed departure from Ireland close the volume. In the mean time the book is full of literary gossip and anecdote. There are parts of it as frankly indecent as Rabelais, and yet when some one of his friends mentioned Moore's indecent books the author was as surprised and depressed as if the idea was totally novel to him.

The sibylline Mrs. Meynell and a charming and lovely volume of youthful verse by four of her children and four of their friends, *The Eyes of Youth,* are together treated to a particularly naughty paragraph or two, in which Mr. Moore describes the talent of Francis Thompson as consisting in "*un fond de Crashaw avec une garniture de Shelley.*" Mrs. Meynell he remembers chiefly as a "tall, sallow girl with brown eyes and a receding chin who used to show me her poems in manuscript ages ago." She is now a very rarely and wonderfully beautiful woman about whom, probably, more real poetry has been written than about any woman since Beatrice. It must be remembered, when one is reading George Moore's little jokes, that she is the woman to whom Ruskin, George Meredith, Coventry Patmore, Lionel Johnson, Francis Thompson, G. K. Chesterton, and scores of other poets and thinkers have paid reverent tribute, and that her own verse and essays rank high in the history of English literature. George Moore at the moment of writing was out of tune with Romanism and all connected with it. He was also at the same time, doubtless, writing "The Lake." How he can say that Francis Thompson "avoided piety" it is difficult to understand. Is the "Hound of Heaven" impious?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In his eagerness to prove that no literature could possibly be written by a Catholic, the author makes a rather clever analysis of Newman's style in the first few chapters of the *Apologia*.

The chief charm of the book is its wit and its candid *intimité*. It is not a deep book nor is Mr. George Moore's culture at all awe-inspiring, though at times he has the air of proclaiming it so. He never by chance mentions a writer or thinker or painter with whom the average reader is not perfectly well acquainted, and his wit is the outgrowth of his ill temper with his friends and his inability to get on smoothly with other men. Still, the book is so frank, so open, so almost childishly confiding, that it makes most delightful, if not uplifting, reading.

MISS JULIA, THE STRONGER, CREDITORS, PARIAH. By AUGUST STRINDBERG. Translated by EDWIN BJORKMAN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

The effort to set Strindberg beside Ibsen as a great interpreter of life has failed and must fail. Unity of construction, dramatic action, and swift, incisive dialogue are all that Strindberg has to offer. His mind was diseased to the point of insanity. His life was one of long and almost uninterrupted torture; he was ill-born, ill-bred, ill-married several times, and he suffered physically and mentally all his life. It is out of the question that any such abnormal experience of life should be able to produce for those born, if not adequate, at least native to this planet, an instructive picture of life. The best one can say is that a great literary talent wallowed in the most unalleviated and sordid of human horrors.

"Miss Julia" has been played at Copenhagen by the Students' Association and again on the Freie Bühne in Berlin. It is a play so revolting that even the plot is impossible to repeat. The author says that he has tried in this play to treat a theme that is, has been, and always will be of lasting interest—namely, that of ascendency or decline, of higher or lower, of better or worse. He also adds that the story came to him from real life. It is tragic, but so disgusting as to miss the real point of tragedy, to stir the emotions of terror or pity.

"The Stronger" is no more than a sketch or a "scene." There are but two characters: Mrs. X, an actress, married; Miss Y, an actress, unmarried. The scene is a *tour de force* in that the second character never speaks throughout the scene. Again, it is the intrinsic matter which divorces sympathy, for the manner of recounting is able. What one asks is why should two women care for one man who was no more than a shuttlecock twirling from one to the other, and what strength is there in loving what is unworthy?

"Creditors" contains, in Thekla, Stringberg's picture of a woman. The preface says that he considered this portrait fairly representative of the sex, and when one adds that the plot again is not one to be repeated and when one adds that the woman had neither sense, decency, nor honor, one may dispose of this play. Were one to compare Thekla to Ibsen's Hedda, it would make Hedda almost a saint, for at least she wanted something; she was reaching out for something to make life worth while. Thekla is without a single stirring of human aspiration.

Of the four plays contained in these two volumes, "Pariah" only can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be read without disgust. "Mr. X," says the translator's preface, "is much less interesting as a superman *in spe* than as an illustration of what a morally and mentally normal man can do with the tools furnished him by our new understanding of human ways and human motives."

The only conclusions to be drawn from these plays wherein criminals, wantons, weaklings, meet is that too unrelieved a view of the degradation of life is as false as the most evasive idealism. Life has at least moments of relief from horror.

YOUR UNITED STATES. By ARNOLD BENNETT. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1912.

There are many ways of writing about a country. One is to live in it, study it, become proficient in its literature, and ultimately reproduce for others a nation and a literature. This is what Professor Giles did for China. Another way is to know nothing at all about a land; to hasten through it, giving frank account of one's impressions for what they are worth. The interest then veers from the country to the writer's mind. It is not so much, indeed, the country depicted that one gets as the instructive reactions of the author, so that the interest is psychological rather than historic. This volume, then, is not in the least our United States, but "Arnold Bennett: His United States."

Of the *Five Towns* Arnold Bennett knows everything. He knows all the people, how they look, and what they think. He has written tales and comedies, exhaustive novels, and great full books about the characters and the lives of the inhabitants. His great genius, perhaps, lies in his power of painting Peter de Hoogh interiors, while the present volume is distinctly of the impressionistic poster variety.

It is only natural that it should not be an accurate portrait of the country. Only a demigod could see a country accurately and correctly in six or seven weeks. Naturally, many isolated incidents seemed to him to point to national characteristics. Allowing entirely for the fact that the book is not descriptive of a country so much as an account of the adventures of a *Five Towns* mind seeing the United States, we may enjoy the keenness and brilliancy of the volume.

The book is brilliantly written. It is full of fine word-pictures, and if one can afford to be indifferent to the author's art criticism one can rely on his sense of fitness and comparative values. His wonder and delight at our railroad stations, our sky-scraping landscape, our beautiful streets, our leisurely suburban towns, are vivid and picturesque. It is instructive and edifying to set this volume beside Henry James's book of American cities, and from the two any reader might derive an excellent idea of how our civilization strikes the alien and the outsider.

THE TASK OF SOCIAL HYGIENE. By HAVELOCK ELLIS. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1912.

In the *Task of Social Hygiene* Havelock Ellis has made one of the most important of modern contributions to the all-absorbing and ubiquitously discussed woman question. It is a book that cannot be too urgently recommended to the facile magazine-writers who are flooding current and evanescent literature with the opinions founded upon their family

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

life or their personal experience. To those who are likely to think seriously for a minute of such books as Ida Tarbell's *Business of Being a Woman,* or Jane Johnston Christie's *The Advance of Woman,* the book furnishes so excellent an introduction and so well-grounded an historic sense of the whole movement as to make these books entirely superfluous.

Havelock Ellis understands that the great field of woman's activity is to aid in the production of a finer race. He also knows that for the past two centuries we have been slowly moving toward the present crisis. He makes very clear that the woman movement is a much larger and more serious thing than a mere demand for political liberty; that the ballot in the hands of woman will never be as Frances Power Cobbe declared thirty years ago "the crown and completion" of progress, nor will it create, as the irrepressible Christobel Pankhurst says, "A new heaven and a new earth." It will merely be the means women have for furthering social legislation and contribute to the passing of laws for the protection and welfare of women and children.

Woman's political enfranchisement is the vestibule to woman's emancipation. "The vote," says Havelock Ellis, "is merely an act of justice and a reasonable condition of social hygiene." He makes it quite clear that the vote is not an end in itself, but a means to the most important of ends—namely, that "of creating human beings best fitted for modern life, the practical realization of sound eugenics."

That the woman movement is here inevitably and for good there is no question, and the only possible service of the conservative is that of perhaps guiding it into the right channels. The great service of free women will be the birth and care of a nobler race; a race that can neither be born nor nurtured of political slaves.

The chapter on the "Significance of the Falling Birth-rate" is an excellent corrective to the alarmists who cry out for quantity regardless of quality. Large families are the stigma of degeneration, and it is the very essence of civilization that with the growth of social stability the birth-rate as well as the death-rate should fall.

The chapters on "Eugenics and Love," "Immorality and the Law," "The War against War" may be recommended as the sanest and ablest contributions to these subjects that have found their way into print. The whole course of Havelock Ellis's activity and study, his monumental work on the *Psychology of Sex,* has prepared him to speak authoritatively on the subject of the significance and the historic value of the woman movement.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED